This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

9015 00394 758 0
University of Michigan – BUHR

MODERN ENGLISH.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Recent Exemplifications of False Philology. Pp. 124. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.
For opinions of the press, see the end of this volume.

In preparation.

A volume of Philological Essays, in which most of the following subjects, and perhaps some others, will be treated of. English Dictionaries. Modern English in Making. The English of the Bible. Popular Etymology. English Hybrids. Americanisms. Reliable, Dilation, and their Respective Congeners. Sundry Modernisms, Established and Unestablished, Lawful and Lawless.

17216

MODERN ENGLISH.

BY

FITZEDWARD HALL,

M.A., HON. D.C.L. OXON.,

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, AND OF INDIAN JURISPRUDENCE, IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

Εἴ τίς με ἐλέγξαι, καὶ παραστῆσαί μοι, ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὑπολαμβάνω ἢ πράσσω, δύναται, χαίρων μεταθήσομαι. Ζητῶ γὰρ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὑφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἐβλάβη. Βλάπτεται δὲ ὁ ἐπιμένων ἐπὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀπάτης καὶ ἀγνοίας. *Marcus Antoninus.*

La materia de' libri par cosa di poco momento, perchè tratta di parole. Mà dà queste parole vengono l'opinioni nel mondo, che causano le partialità, le sedizione, e finalmente le guerre. Sono parole, sí, mà che, in consequenza, tirano seco esserciti armati. *Paolo Sarpi.*

Ye know not what hurt ye do to learning, that care not for wordes, but for matter, and so make a devorse betwixt the tong and the hart. *Roger Ascham.*

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.

NEW YORK:

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG, & CO.

1873.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873, by
SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG, & CO.,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, PRINTERS, BUNGAY.

To

My Mother.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	LANGUAGE UNSTABLE	1
II.	PROPRIETY IN SPEECH	25
III.	INTUITIVE PHILOLOGY	42
IV.	PURISM	98
V.	NEOTERISM	135
VI.	NEOTERISTIC CANONS	164
VII.	OUR GRANDFATHERS' ENGLISH . .	198
VIII.	MODERNISMS EXEMPLIFIED	278
APPENDIX.—ENGLISH IMPERFECTS PASSIVE . .		321
ADDITIONS		360
INDEX OF AUTHORS, ETC.		369
INDEX OF WORDS AND PHRASES		379

PREFACE.

THE contents of this volume are made up, in the main, of selections from a large number of essays which I have composed, within the last ten years, for my own amusement. As to the particular chapters here grouped together, seeing that they were written at considerable intervals, and, as soon as written, were laid aside and well nigh forgotten, I found, on revising them, that, almost of course, I had, here and there, in some measure repeated myself. After all, however, the repetitions have seemed too slight to demand that I should be at the trouble of removing them; and, accordingly, I have let them stand. For the rest, it is not impossible, that things which have offered themselves, at various times, as worth the saying, may deserve that attention which they might, if said only once, have failed to secure.

When it is announced, that the object of this disquisition is to justify modern English, as well as to exemplify it, the principle which has actuated my division and disposition of my subject-matter will at once become intelligible.

To assist a right judgment of language, as presented either in our own age, or in any other age, I have thought it good, first of all, to emphasize its abiding instability; and, next, I have dwelt on propriety in speech, as divisible into correctness and appropriateness. Then follow specimens of such erroneous conclusions as one is sure to be landed in, from electing, in philology, assumption and divination, in preference to investigation and induction. Purism and neoterism are, in course, discussed; and to these discussions some experimental rules are subjoined, which devisers of new words, if they wish their devisings to outlive themselves, neglect to their cost. The two last chapters exhibit abundant exemplifications of English which has dropped away, and of English which has come into vogue, within the last hundred years or thereabouts. In the Appendix I have reprinted, in essentially its original form, a paper which, written in 1871, has already appeared in the pages of a Magazine. I will here add, touching the idiom vindicated in the Appendix, that a very learned and critical neighbour of mine, a gentleman now in his eighty-fifth year, assures me, that expressions like *is being built* have been colloquially current in the best English society ever since his boyhood.

It has been well observed, by an acute observer and profound thinker of our time, that "popular opinions, on subjects not palpable to sense, are often true, but seldom or never the whole truth." In overwhelming proportion, we further find, as the groundwork of human assents, unverified traditions, eked out by the suggestions of greed and of whim; and it is hardly to be

denied, that, regarding any truth whatsoever which is not of obvious perception in its fulness, paradoxy is likely to be orthodoxy. Error, save in the exact sciences, and in awards by the rule of thumb, has still, pretty nearly everywhere, the ascendency; and, as concerns the sphere of later English philology, in especial, I have looked only to be disappointed, for a guide to it in whom I can trust otherwise than occasionally. To no one can any benefit accrue from such aerial speculations, shallow sophisms, and self-sufficient reveries, as crowd almost every book on our language that we turn to. Philologists are much too apt to forget, that their function is, chiefly, to record, and never to legislate; and, instead of the wholesome bread of truth, they beguile us, far too often, with the worthless stone of their own caprice. If we choose to dissert on English, it may, at least, be demanded of us to beware of substituting fictions for facts, and dogmatism for dialectic inference, and, like the frog in the fable, of mistaking the kerb of our own little philologic well for the far-off horizon of science. For my own part, I have striven to build on a foundation of due amplitude, the verities of history, a thing totally impersonal to myself. No more than the cut of one's coat, or the style of one's nose, have private chimeras here any relevance; and, except in reliance on explicit testimony and straightforward logic, the philologist may depend upon it, that he will never reach any goal which he would not much better avoid. I have thus indicated, negatively, my general mode of procedure; and, as best I could, I have adhered to it.

In a work like the present, it is unavoidable that one should not say something about usage. I do not hold, however, as I have been charged with holding, that "usage is the one criterion of proper speech." The general consent of the best writers and speakers among our contemporaries should be accepted for our guidance in matters of syntax and idiom; but, as to our choice of phraseology, whether it is to be simple or scholastic, popular or technical, established or neoteric, we ought, in reason, to be governed by considerations of expedience. And then there is the minting of new words, a direct innovation on usage, and yet a thing which we ought not to prevent, even if it were preventible. No one will arraign these positions as wanting in liberalism; but there is, nevertheless, nothing, in their liberalism, of lawlessness. The more closely one looks into usage, the firmer must be one's conviction, that its adjudications have greatly more of freedom and elasticity than find countenance with the rabble of mere word-fanciers. Solecisms apart, it is much less the choice of expressions, than the use we put them to, that makes true English. My views on such points, and, indeed, on most of the various topics handled in the following pages, are, I know, novel, as coming from an American. At the same time, they are those of the majority of educated Englishmen. And this I assert with confidence; for my intercourse with educated Englishmen has, perhaps, been, as of longer duration, so of a more intimate character, than has fallen to the lot of any other American who has made the English language a subject of serious study. The

weight of this argument will, I am aware, be denied; but, let Englishmen scorn us, and move our just aversion, as they may, the fact still stands, that, looking to their superior culture, literary and social, we shall do wisely in deferring to their example, if we would learn how best to speak and to write.

It occurred to me, while meditating the preparation of this volume, that it might be prudent to salute the public with something of smaller bulk first. In prosecution of this idea, and in the belief, that there is no more effective way to teach sound principles than by dissecting and exploding unsound, I picked out a handful of material from a mass which lay ready at my elbow, and worked it up into my *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*. But opinion, in matters of language, is, with most people, everything; and ninety-nine in a hundred, if only once certified, that adhesion to a given view is associated with a name of popular weight, are quite ready to acquiesce in it without further ado. All but universally, in truth, it is simply the prejudices and the crotchets of persons who have risen to reputation, that, by being adopted, enable vulgar minds to escape from absolute vacancy. In the critique which I am speaking of, regardless of anything but facts and a scientific treatment of facts, I passed in review a motley cluster of philologists, semi-philologists, and entire philologasters. Abstractedly from their avowed pretensions, the authors of the misleading fallacies and decisions which I scrutinized, were nothing to me. If they had written anonymously, I should have done by them precisely as I did.

Personality, otherwise than by way of holding up a mirror to them, I diligently eschewed. There is one of their number, however, a wholesale sponsor, and also an originator, of superficial conceits, whose clientry of clapper-clawers, misrepresenting the character of my strictures, and fathering on me, with frontless mendacity, the most preposterous principles, have, in requital, shown themselves, as an old author phrases it, valiantly railipotent. Pretension to knowledge they make none whatever; and, in justice, I concede to them, for not making any,—but for nothing else,—the credit of a ludicrous honesty. It was, further, only to be expected, that persons capable, in their anger, of merely making a senseless clatter, and of comporting themselves after a wholly unseemly fashion, should be unable to conceal the real ground of their disquietude. Their favourite persuasions have, without question, received a shock of unusual severity; and they vainly hope, by a demonstration of violence and incredulity, to piece together their shattered illusions. I might, to be sure, easily have afforded to pass them by in silence; and I have here spoken of them, only because of their supplying an instructive illustration, how common it is for the sons of feebleness, immediately on being confronted with the discomfort of new ideas, to throw honesty to the winds, and to wax warm and hysterical. By scholars my critique has been welcomed with great cordiality and many kind words; and the demand for it was so unexpected, that, within a month after its publication, I felt en-

couraged to put to press, without delay, the volume now in the hand of the reader.

Almost ever since I left college, in 1846, I have held laborious official positions, mostly in India. For many years, while there, spending a considerable part of every day in the saddle, I had little leisure for study. In fact, until four years ago, I have rarely, since I came to man's estate, had any hours for reading and writing, except such as would rightfully have been given to sleep. Scant opportunity, therefore, have I enjoyed of becoming a thorough scholar; and to thorough scholarship I lay no claim. For all that, I have contrived, at odd times, to run through something of divers literatures, and to give some thought to my mother-tongue. On not a tithe of the books I have skimmed have I taken notes serviceable for philological purposes; and yet my memoranda on English words and uses of words have grown to a matter of half a million. Hitherto, only a small share of these has been turned to account; and, whether the residue of this apparatus shall go the way of waste paper, circumstances must determine.

Marlesford, Wickham Market, Suffolk,
July 15, 1873.

CORRECTIONS.

PAGE	LINE OF NOTES	FOR	READ
35	9	Fletcher	Hooker [?]
88	5	*Reigne*	*Raigne*
137	7	Sir	the Rev.
141	13	*analogous*	*analogue*
167	25	*Reigne*	*Raigne*
176	4	Colly	Colley
182	15	*managery*	*menagery*
234	3	*Eccl. Vind.*	*The Hist. of Episc.*
247	23	Hornbeck	Horneck
265	14	Abbot	Abbott
	LINE OF TEXT		
330	11	Rev. Dr.	Dr.

CHAPTER I.

LANGUAGE UNSTABLE.

Mutantur in ævum
Singula, et inceptum alternat natura tenorem,
Quodque dies antiqua tulit post auferet ipsa.
Pontanus.

Not many years ago, a member of the House of Lords, on being taken to task, by one of his august peers, for some solecism of speech, desired to be informed whether the right could be denied him, as a free-born Briton, of devising English of his own. Befitting though this style of retort may be to delinquents of exceptional immunities, a less lofty tone is more appropriate to ordinary transgressors. And these, we find, when charged with verbal or grammatic offence, are wont, in strict obedience to the proprieties, to defend themselves from a humbler vantage-ground. Much on a parity, however, with the noble senator's self-assertive interrogatory, for availing to foreclose every avenue to rational reply, is the demand, so often advanced by practitioners of anomalous words and phrases, what it is they are speaking, if not English. But, as will appear in the course of these pages, men of learning

and reflection, equally with mere parrots, are seen, when discoursing on language, to deal in utterances quite as inconsiderate or fallacious as the samples just instanced.

Even in Cicero we meet with the strain of thoughtlessness here adverted to, where he writes: "quo magis expurgandus est sermo, et adhibenda, tanquam obrussa, ratio quæ mutari non potest, nec utendum pravissima consuetudinis regula."[1] "One great end of this undertaking is to fix the English language," says Dr. Johnson, in his *Plan of an English Dictionary*.[2] Previously, Swift had had much at heart, "that some method should be thought on for ascertaining and fixing our language for ever, after such alterations are made in it as shall be thought requisite;" and hence his *Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue*.[3] Still earlier than the time of Swift, the

---

[1] *Brutus*, LXXIV.

[2] Dr. Johnson, in *The History of the English Language*, prefixed to his *Dictionary*, speaks of causes "which, notwithstanding the care of writers and societies instituted to obviate them, are even now daily making innovations in every living language."

It seems, from this, that Dr. Johnson really conceived a living language to be capable of fixation. Nor is this the only other place where he has given token of such a belief.

[3] This *Proposal* was written in 1712. There we also read, with reference to our language: "If it were once refined to a certain standard, perhaps there might be ways found out to fix it for ever, or, at least, till we are invaded and made a conquest [*sic*] by some other State."

Again: "What Horace says of words' going off and perishing like leaves, and new ones' coming in their place, is a misfortune he laments, rather than a thing he approves."

Once more: "I see no absolute necessity why any language should be perpetually changing; for we find many examples to the contrary. From Homer to Plutarch was above a thousand

Earl of Roscommon "formed the plan of a society for refining our language, and fixing its standard."[1] To the visionaries here quoted the elementary fact, regarding language, that irresistible mutability is one of its invariable characteristics, can never, it should seem, have seriously presented itself.

Expressions of satisfaction with English as already developed, deprecations of any further alteration of it, and lamentations over its degeneracy, may be expected, as matters of course, from those who believe a language to be susceptible of fixation, and repine at the perversity which has refused to fix it.

As long ago as 1557, Sir John Cheke expressed himself as follows:

"I am of this opinion, that our own tung shold be written cleane and pure, unmixt and unmangeled with borowing of other tunges, wherin if we take not heed bi

---

years: so long, at least, the purity of the Greek tongue may be allowed to last; and we know not how far before."

Swift would have found it difficult, consistently with scholarship, to define "purity," as he here applies the term. His Greek, like Shakespeare's Latin, must have been ".small".

With an extravagance which he should have blushed even to imagine, he tells Lord Oxford, to whom his *Proposal* is addressed: "If you will not take some care to settle our language, and put it into a state of continuance, I cannot promise that your memory shall be preserved above a hundred years, farther than by imperfect tradition."

The sound sense of an anonymous writer who commented on the Dean's dream will be evident from the following extract. "The Doctor may as well set up a society to find out the Grand Elixir, the Perpetual Motion, the Longitude, and other such discoveries, as to fix our language beyond their own times. The test of their successors will vary with the age, and their rules grow obsolete, as well as their words." *Reflections on Dr. Swift's Letter to the Earl of Oxford*, &c., p. 25.

[1] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Roscommon*.

tiim, ever borowing and never payeng, she shall be fain to keep her house as bankrupt. For then doth our tung naturallie and praisablie utter her meaning, whan she bouroweth no conterfeitness of other tunges to attire her self withall, but useth plainlie her own, with such shift as nature, craft, experiens, and folowing of other excellent doth lead her unto; and, if she want, at ani tiim (as, being unperfight, she must), yet let her borow with suche bashfulnes, that it mai appeer that, if either the mould of our own tung could serve us to fascion a woord of our own, or if the old denisoned wordes could content and ease this neede, we wold not boldly venture of unknowen wordes." [1]

Much to the same purpose writes Verstegan, within half a century after:

"Since the tyme of Chaucer, more Latin & French hath bin mingled with our toung then left out of it; but, of late, wee have falne to such borowing of woords from

[1] This is from a letter given at the end of *The Courtyer* (ed. 1561), translated by Sir Thomas Hoby, from the Italian of Castiglione.

Henri Estienne, writing in 1566, shows himself quite as much a conservative as Cheke. "Toutesfois je ne veux pas nier . . . que je ne sçay où desormais on se pourra fournir de language François qui soit mettable partout, veu que de jour en jour les bons mots sont descriez entre ceux qui, s'escoutans pindarizer à la nouvelle mode, barbarizent aux oreilles de ceux qui suivent l'ancienne." *Apologie pour Herodote* (ed. 1735), Vol. 1, p. xxxix.

It is curious to note what words were becoming French, in the time of the great Greek lexicographer.

Of *analogie* he says: "Si les oreilles Françoises peuvent porter ce mot," *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. xliv.

Of *stratagème:* "Puis que ce mot Grec depuis quelque temps a trouvé lieu au language François." *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 300, 301.

Of *assassins:* "Car il a falu trouver des termes nouveaux pour la nouvelle meschanceté." *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 394.

"Ce qu'on appelle aujourdhuy *supercherie*." *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 400.

Latin,[1] French, and other toungs, that it had bin beyond all stay and limit; which albeit some of us do lyke wel, and think our toung thereby much bettred, yet do strangers therefore carry the farre lesse opinion thereof; some saying that it is, of it self, no language at all, but the scum of many languages; others, that it is most barren, and that wee are dayly faine to borrow woords for it (as though it yet lacked making), out of other languages, to patche it up withall, and that, yf wee were put to repay our borrowed speech back again to the languages that may lay claime unto it, wee should bee left litle better then dumb, or scarsly able to speak any thing that should bee sencible.

"For myne own parte, I hold them deceaved that think our speech bettered by the aboundance of our dayly borrowed woords; for they, beeing of an other nature, and not originally belonging to our language, do not, neither can they, in our toung, beare their natural and true deryvations; and, therefore, as wel may we fetch woords from the Ethiopians, or East or West Indians, and thrust them into our language, and baptise all by the name of English, as those which wee dayly take from the Latin, or languages thereon depending. And heerhence it cometh, (as, by often experience, is found,) that, some Englishmen discoursing together, others beeing present, and of our own nation, and that naturally speak the English toung, are not able to understand what the others say, notwithstanding they call it English that they speak."[2]

---

[1] Puttenham speaks of "corruption" of English, "occasioned chiefly by the peevish affectation .... of clerks and scholers or secretaries, long since." Examples of this "corruption" he instances in *innumerable, revocable, irrevocable, irradiation, depopulation*, "which are not naturall Normans, nor yet French, but altered Latines, and without any imitation at all." It seems that he regretted "innombrable," &c. *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), p. 89 (ed. 1811).

[2] *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, &c. (Antwerp ed., 1605), pp. 204, 205.

"But, doubtlesse, yf our selves pleased to use the treasurie of our own toung, wee should as litle need to borrow woords from any language extravagant from ours, as any such borroweth from us; our toung, in it self, beeing sufficient and copious enough, without this dayly borrowing from somany, as take scorne to borrow any from us."[1]

Camden shall next be cited:

"The alteration and admiration in our tongue, as in all others, hath been brought in by entrance of strangers, as Danes, Normans, and others which have swarmed hither; by traffick (for new words, as well as for new wares, have always come in by the tyranne Time, which altereth all under heaven); by use, which swayeth most, and hath an absolute command in words; and by pregnant wits. Specially since that learning, after long banishment, was recalled in the time of King Henry the Eight, it hath been beautified and enriched out of other good tongues, partly by enfranchising and endenizing strange words, partly by refining and mollifying old words, partly by implanting new words with artificial composition, happily containing themselves within the bounds prescribed by Horace. So that our tongue is (and I doubt not but hath been) as copious, pithy, and significative as any other tongue in Europe; and I hope we are not yet, and shall not hereafter, come to that which Seneca saw, in his time: 'When men's minds begin once to inure themselves to dislike, whatsoever is usual is disdained. They affect novelty in speech; they recal forworn and uncuth words; they forge new phrases; and that which is newest is best liked:

[1] *A Restitution*, &c., p. 206. Among Verstegan's quaintnesses are *countryship* for 'nationality,' *fore-elder* for 'ancestor,' *fuldo* for 'retrieve,' *offspring* for 'origin,' and *outlander* for 'foreigner. *Of these*, and many more, quite likely not one was his own invention.

there is presumptuous and farre fetching of words. And some there are that think it a grace, if their speech do hover, and thereby hold the hearer in suspense.' You know what followeth." [1]

Bishop Sprat, having proposed the foundation of an Academy, like that of the French, goes on to say:

"But, besides, if we observe well the English language, we shall find that it seems, at this time, more then others, to require some such aid to bring it to its last perfection. The truth is, it has been, hitherto, a little too carelessly handled, and, I think, has had less labor spent about its polishing then it deserves. Till the time of King Henry the Eighth, there was scarse any man regarded it, but Chaucer; and nothing was written, in it, which one would be willing to read twice, but some of his poetry. But then it began to raise it self a little, and to sound tolerably well. . . . . And now, when men's minds are somewhat settled, their passions allai'd, and the peace of our country gives us the opportunity of such diversions, if some sober and judicious men would take the whole mass of our language into their hands, as they find it, and would set a mark on the ill words, correct those which are to be retain'd, admit and establish the good, and make some emendations in the accent and grammar, I dare pronounce,

[1] *Camden's Remains*, &c. (ed. 1674), pp. 36, 37. No one but a countryman of Camden's could have added: "And not long since, for the honour of our native tongue, Henry Fitz-Allen, Earl of Arundel, in his travaile into Italy, and the Lord William Howard, of Effingham, in his government of Calice, albeit they were not ignorant of other forraine tongues, would answer no strangers, by word or writing, but onely in English; as, in this consideration, also, before them, Cardinal Wolsey, in his ambassage into France, commanded all his servants to use no French, but meer English, to the French, in all communication whatsoever."

For what is here said of the Earl of Arundel, also see Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, p. 227.

that our speech would quickly arrive at as much plenty as it is capable to receive, and at the greatest smoothness which its derivation from the rough German will allow it."[1]

No less rash than others is Dr. Bentley, writing in 1697:

"As for our English tongue, the great alterations it has undergone in the two last centuries are principally owing to that vast stock of Latin words which we have transplanted into our own soil; which being, now, in a manner exhausted, one may easily presage that it will not have such changes in the two next centuries. Nay, it were no difficult contrivance, if the public had any regard to it, to make the English tongue immutable, unless hereafter some foreign nation shall invade and overrun us."[2]

---

[1] *The History of the Royal Society*, &c. (ed. 1667), pp. 41, 42.

"This is one of the few books which selection of sentiment and elegance of diction have been able to preserve, though written upon a subject flux and transitory. *The History of the Royal Society* is now read, not with the wish to know what they were then doing, but how their transactions are exhibited by Sprat."

So says Dr. Johnson. The decorous debility of Sprat is much more justly appreciated by Godwin. "Though Sprat was the first importer of neatness into his native tongue, yet he has a singular air of feebleness. His composition reminds the reader of the appearance of an old man he may have seen, who, though dressed with care and spruceness, yet has something strangely old-fashioned in his air, and imbecil in his motions." *The Enquirer*, p. 428.

Godwin's saying of Sprat,—"our English Cicero," in the estimation of Bentley,—that he originated "neatness" of English, is as bad as what Sprat says of our old literature.

Though, quite as much as Cowley, a studious conservative in his phraseology, Sprat, especially towards the end of his *History of the Royal Society*, ventures on some very odd spellings. Many of his contemporaries write, like him, *discorage*, *heven*, *hevy*, *mony*, *neighbor*, *pible*, *savior*, *theater*, *traveled*, &c. &c.; but he is rather peculiar in his aversion to the final *e* mute, whence his *applaus*, *arrogat*, *aspers*, *avers*, *becaus*, *cours*, *desolat*, *discours*, *examin*, *increas*, *moderat*, *ow*, *propagat*, *rais*, *tru*.

[2] *The Works of Richard Bentley, D.D.* (ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce), Vol. 2, p. 13.

Let us now listen to Dr. Johnson:

"Of antiquated or obsolete words, none will be inserted but such as are to be found in authors who wrote [*sic*] since the accession of Elizabeth, from which we date the golden age of our language." [1]

"I have fixed Sidney's work for the boundary beyond which I make few excursions. From the authors which rose in the time of Elizabeth a speech might be formed adequate to all the purposes of use and elegance." [2]

"So far have I been from any care to grace my pages with modern decorations, that I have studiously endeavoured to collect examples and authorities from the writers before the Restoration,[3] whose works I regard as the 'wells of English undefiled',[4] as the pure sources of genuine diction." [5]

Bentley strangely asserts, that "the orthography, or way of spelling," "is the principal variation of the modern English from the old." *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 7.

The English here referred to as "old" must be that of very moderate antiquity indeed.

[1] *The Plan of an English Dictionary.* As, however, Johnson declares, in his *Preface to Shakespeare*, that, in Shakespeare's time, "the English nation .... was yet struggling to emerge from barbarity," it seems that he considered the excellence of a language as having very little dependence on civilization.

[2] *Dictionary*, Preface.

[3] Without much trouble, I could show that Johnson should have referred to an earlier date than 1660—in some cases, by a whole century,—a full thousand words and senses of words which he illustrates solely out of writings subsequent to that era. The truth is, that his acquaintance with pre-Restoration, and especially with Elizabethan, authors was of the most meagre.

[4] We have seen what Johnson says of Sprat, whom he also calls "an author whose pregnancy of imagination and elegance of language have deservedly set him high in the ranks of literature". He pronounces, too, that "whoever wishes to attain an English style, familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes of Addison."

In the former, with his sterile wit and nerveless insipidity, there is nothing to remind one either of his predecessors or even of his contemporaries; and the latter, while notably distinguished, as a

[5] *[Note in next page.]*

In the *Connoisseur*, No. 71, by Colman and Thornton, we read:

"The English language is sufficiently copious and expressive, without any farther adoption of new terms; and

---

stylist, for ease, a quality not to be imitated, combines with it the extreme of inexactness, and, more particularly, is altogether anti-archaic. As it occurred to Godwin, Johnson, in awarding the praise he gives these writers, contradicts his position which limits the "wells of English undefiled" to the century preceding the recall of the second Charles.

By the way, the eulogy bestowed on Chaucer by Spenser's well-worn metaphor has not been quite unanimously recognized as condign. Thomas Jordan, for instance, makes his Wildblood ejaculate:

"By the wanton memory of Chaucer, I could turn poet,
And write in as heathen English, and as bawdy."

The Walks of Islington and Hogsdon (1657), Act 4, Sc. 1.

[5] *Dictionary*, Preface. A hundred and two years elapsed between the accession of Elizabeth and the Restoration; and "the pure sources of genuine diction"—as if "genuine diction" could have sources other than "pure,"—are, thus, restricted to about three generations. Could the moody and narrow melancholist ever have asked himself what proportion of his own diction was, by his own canon, spurious?

Swift, in his *Proposal*, allows a shorter reign to sterling English, by eighteen years, than Johnson. "The period wherein the English tongue received most improvement I take to commence with the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and to conclude with the Great Rebellion of forty-two."

Further on, he says: "From the Civil War to this present time [1712], I am apt to doubt whether the corruptions in our language have not at least equalled the refinements of it; and these corruptions very few of the best authors in our age have wholly escaped."

"Some of the causes of the predilection of Swift and Johnson for the age of Queen Elizabeth are obvious. It is well known in what terms of acrimony and personal hatred Swift attacked Dryden and some of the most eminent writers of Charles's reign. Johnson's partiality for old English manners and practices was unbounded; nor can there be produced, from the annals of our literature, a more fervent anti-whig and anti-gallican. But, even if we could succeed in setting aside these two illustrious men, as incompetent witnesses, we should still meet with a host of critics adhering to a similar opinion.

"The practice, however, of Swift and Johnson was better than *their* precepts. It may be affirmed, particularly of the latter, that

the native words seem to me to have far more force than any foreign auxiliaries, however pompously ushered in: as British soldiers fight our battles better than the troops taken into our pay."

Dr. Priestley, in 1761, was content with our language as he found it; and he expected it to continue pretty much as it was then:

"If the English language hath not already attained to its maturity, we may safely pronounce that it never will; and, if it be not now in a condition to perpetuate itself, and stand the attacks of time, no method that we can at this day take will rescue it from oblivion.

"More than a century is already elapsed since Dryden began to be admired as a writer; and where is the probability of the prophecy of Mr. Pope ever coming to pass,

'And such as Chaucer is shall Dryden be'?

"It is writing that fixes and gives stability to a language; for hardly any of the causes that contribute to the revolutions of vocal language do at all affect that which is written. And, when a language is so much read, written, and diffused in books through the bulk of the nation that

---

there is not, perhaps, a single modern writer, admired for his elegance of composition, who has less 'made our ancient volumes the ground-work of his style', than this author." Godwin, *The Enquirer*, p. 379.

Going to the opposite extreme, as compared with Swift and Johnson, Godwin depreciates our older writers most unjustly. "It is sufficiently evident," he writes, with advertence to the days of Queen Elizabeth, "that our language, at that time, comparatively lay in a sort of chaos, and that no just notions were yet formed of simplicity in diction, or precision of utterance, much less, of the arrangement of clauses, and construction of a period. The best authors wander at random, with no better compass to steer by than each man's private and particular hypothesis and conception. Nay, they are worse than this; for nothing is more evident than each man's uncertainty, and inconsistency with himself." *Ibid.*, pp. 400, 401.

speaks it, as the English in its present state, it would be absolutely miraculous, were it to receive any considerable alteration." [1]

Good English was, however, about a hundred years ago, in a rapid decline, on the authority of the learned Miss Carter:

"You and I, my dear friend, have lived to see the mushroom growth of a new language, in our own country, filled with phrases which nobody could have understood, when we were young." [2]

An anonymous Tory wrote, in 1827:

"We are inclined to consider the English language as having attained that fulness of maturity which leaves no wish for increase, but only anxiety for preservation.[3]

---

[1] *The Rudiments of English Grammar*, &c. (ed. 1826), pp. 489, 490.

[2] *Letters to Mrs. Montagu* (ed. 1817), Vol. 3, p. 95. The passage quoted was written in 1778.

The excellent and learned Miss Carter I generally have much pleasure in quoting. Her language, for the most part, is very correct; but here is an exception. "Your description of his *septuagesimal* [read *septuagenarian*] gallantry would make one laugh," &c. *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 145.

[3] In a similar spirit writes M. Francis Wey, regarding French: "À l'âge où la littérature française est aujourd'hui parvenue, il doit être possible à l'écrivain de peindre toutes les nuances de sa pensée sans sortir du vocabulaire consacré. Le langage qui convient au siècle présent, à ses institutions renouvelées, aux transformations de sa littérature, doit être formé. Le nouveau régime est quadragénaire. À cet âge, on ne balbutie plus; on sait le nom des choses." *Remarques sur la Langue Française*, &c. (1845), Vol. 1, pp. 173, 174.

Again: "Un idiome aussi mûr que le nôtre est à la hauteur de toutes les idées." *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 140.

This last remark can never be true of a language, until thought shall become incapable of further modification.

And, long ago, Vaugelas wrote: "Quand une langue a nombre et cadence en ses périodes, comme la langue française l'a maintenant, elle est en sa perfection; et, étant venue à ce point, on en peut donner des règles certaines qui dureront toujours." Quoted

"Much has been already done to fix the English language; and complete fixity is, now, all that it requires."[1]

Even Lord Macaulay could cant[2] about "the old unpolluted English language", and "how rich that language is in its own proper wealth, and how little it has been improved by all that it has borrowed."

The wailing of the fastidious and capricious Landor is of the most doleful:

"Our own language had, under the translators of the Bible and of the Liturgy, reached the same pitch as the Latin had in the time of Plautus; and the sanctitude of

---

by M. Laveaux, in his *Dictionnaire Raisonné*, &c. (ed. 1822), Vol. 2, p. 601.

[1] *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 35 (1827), pp. 407 and 405.

[2] In his *Essay on The Pilgrim's Progress*. However, in a man who, having lived beyond the middle of the nineteenth century, could yet die a Whig, one should be prepared for adhesion to any mouldy superstition whatsoever. "Sir, he abandoned no policy, no principles; His Lordship is a Whig; these Whigs have neither: protestations serve instead." Landor, *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 59.

Lord Macaulay, with his "old unpolluted English language," is fantastic enough; but Horace Walpole goes very much beyond him. After doing execution on "Danes, Saxons, and Popes", for the harm which they wrought to our ancestors politically, he continues: "Our language suffered as much as our government, and, not having acquired much from our Roman masters, was miserably disfigured by the subsequent invaders. The unconquered parts of the island retained some purity and some precision. The Welsh and Erse tongues wanted not harmony; but never did exist a more barbarous jargon than the dialect still venerated by antiquaries, and called Saxon. It was so uncouth, so inflexible to all composition, that the monks, retaining the idiom, were reduced to write in what they took or meant for Latin. The Norman tyranny succeeded, and gave this Babel of savage sounds a wrench towards their own language," &c. &c. *Historic Doubts*, &c. (ed. 1768), Preface, p. 10.

Why did Walpole stop where he did, instead of receding a thousand or two years further, to find his dream of a pure language realized?

Milton's genius gave it support, until the worst of French invasions overthrew it." [1]

"The Latin language, in the time of Catullus, was nearly in the same state as the English in the time of Milton. Each had attained its full perfection; and yet the vestiges of antiquity were preserved in each." [2]

"Our language was first corrupted by the euphuists: it had reached perfection under the compilers of our Church-service. It fell prostrate in the slipperiness and filth about Charles II., when every gentleman wisht it to be thought that he had been an exile, for his adherence to royalty, so long as to have forgotten his mother-tongue. Cowley, and Dryden, and South himself, were rudely slovenly. The sublime sanctity of Milton was as pure in utterance as in thought: he never was seized by the private influenza; he never went into places where it could be caught." [3]

---

[1] *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 153.

[2] *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 251. Irreconcilably with this, Landor elsewhere dates the decadence of our language from a period prior even to the birth of Milton. "We ought never to have deviated from those who delivered to us our Litany, of which the purity is unapproachable, and the harmony complete. Our tongue has been drooping ever since." *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 100.

Swift, casting his eyes across the Channel, found things there as deplorable as Landor found them at home. "The French [language], for these last fifty years, has been polishing as much as it will bear, and appears to be declining by the natural inconstancy of that people," &c. *A Proposal*, &c.

Part of this was, probably, borrowed, by Swift, from his patron, Sir William Temple, who had written: "The French wits have, for this last age, been, in a manner, wholly turned to the refinement of their language, and, indeed, with such success, that it can hardly be excelled, and runs equally through their verse and their prose." *Miscellanea* (ed. 1696), Part 2, p. 355.

[3] *Walter Savage Landor, a Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 543. What can Landor have known of Cowley and South?

Ben Jonson recognized the ne plus ultra of English in an author who has very little in common with the Church-service, Bacon, to-wit, of whom he says, that he "hath filled up all numbers, and

"Our language is bruised, as it were, and swollen by the Latin; but it is contaminated, enervated, and distorted by the French. If we are to borrow, let us borrow from the principal, and not from the underlings; but, with a little good management, I think we are quite rich enough."[1]

---

performed that, in our tongue, which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome. In short, within his view, and about his times, were all the wits born, that could honour a language or help study. Now things daily fall, wits grow downward, and eloquence grows backward; so that he may be named, and stand as, the mark and *ἀκμή* of our language." *Timber, Scriptorum Catalogus.*

This heavy conservative, though despondent as to the future, differed from the ruck of his fellow-pessimists, in not throwing back the golden age into remote antiquity. He was even contemporary with its latter days. That he resisted innovation was only doing after his kind. His judgment of Spenser, for instance, is, that he, "in affecting the ancients, writ no language; yet I would have him read for his matter, but as Virgil read Ennius." *Ibid., Præcipiendi Modi.*

Having in reference the times which produced our Bible and Prayer-Book, Swift says: "I doubt whether the alterations since introduced have added much to the beauty or strength of the English tongue, though they have taken off a great deal from that simplicity which is one of the greatest perfections of any language." *Proposal*, &c.

[1] *Walter Savage Landor, a Biography*, Vol. 1, p. 162. This passage is from a letter to Dr. Parr, in 1801.

Surely, Dr. Johnson, as both his precepts and his practice bear witness, would never have said what is feigned for him in the subjoined extract.

"*Johnson.* If we begin to reinstate old words, we shall finish by admitting new ones.

"*Tooke.* There would be the less danger of that, as there would be the less need. Yet even new words may be introduced with good effect, and, particularly, when the subject is ludicrous." Landor, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 205.

And would Johnson, or any other first-rate writer of his age, have put "finish by," for "end with"?

Henri Estienne actually held, regarding the function of new words, such views as we find imputed to Horne Tooke.

"Il est bien vray que j'ay moymesme usé d'aucuns mots nouveaux en ce livre; mais ç'a esté où les vieils defailloyent; et puis

"We are sapt by an influx of putridity." [1]

"Our language is running downhill without a drag-chain." [2]

Our received translation of the Bible, to allege one more eulogy on it, is, in the words of Dr. Newman:

"a work which, by the purity of its diction, and the strength and harmony of its style, has deservedly become the very model of good English, and the standard of the language to all future times." [3]

There could be no better illustration than is afforded by some of the extracts here given, of the despotic prejudices of association of ideas, and of the ease with which veneration for what is substantive comes to be extended to what is adjective. With respect to loyalty, if we may believe Mr. Thackeray,[4] the process is precisely the reverse; reverence there having, to begin with, magnificent coats and gorgeous breeches for its object, and, in the end, the august person of Majesty. To Dr. Newman, and to the myriads who think as he does about our English Bible, one would be allowed to whisper, that the poor

---

ils sont tels qu'on voit bien que je les ay forgez à plaisir, pour parler ridiculement des choses ridicules, qui neantmoins par les povres abusez sont estimees fort serieuses." *Apologie pour Herodote*, Vol. 1, pp. xxxix., xl.

[1] *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 97.

[2] *Walter Savage Landor, a Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 526.

[3] *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*, p. 66. But it would be unjust to judge Dr. Newman by a single sally of irreflection. In a coming chapter, I shall quote something on the English language, from the pen of this most admirable writer, very much more rational than the passage transcribed above.

[4] See his *Paris Sketch-book, Meditations at Versailles.*

"Turks" of the Prayer-Book talk exactly in their own fashion, and for reasons strictly analogous to theirs, about the purity of diction, and what not, of "the Blessed Koran." The prevailing speech of any age is the speech called forth by, and best suited to, its peculiar requirements;[1] and, in especial, ever since the Reformation, the ruling language of English religion has been, with rare exceptions, an affair either of studied antiquarianism or of nauseous pedantry. Simplicity, and little more, was aimed at, originally; and it sufficed for times of real earnestness. But the very quaintness of phrase which King James countersigned has attained to be canonized, till a *hath*, or a *thou*, delivered with conventional unction, now well nigh inspires a sensation of solemnity in its hearer, and a persuasion of the sanctanimity of its utterer. To return to Landor, Lord Macaulay, and Dr. Newman, who can doubt that an *Imaginary Conversation*, moulded, as to its English, on the "perfection" reached in the Church-service, would have exhibited its author crippled to something like the inefficiency of Sir Edward Creasy or Sir Arthur Helps; that an Essay for the *Edinburgh Review*, in "the old unpolluted English language," would have been consigned, by the editor, to his balaam-basket; or that an *Apologia*, of such "purity of

[1] "I believe that whoever knows the English tongue in its present extent will be able to express his thoughts without farther help from other nations." Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 208.

To Johnson this was not a platitude. As he viewed things, mankind, besides being in a state of retrogression, had nothing more to learn, and was best employed, provided it had grace left for such employment, in going over the lessons of the past.

diction and strength of style" as we see in our Bible, would remind us of Dean Milman in his *Latin Christianity*, and would not remind us of Cobbett? Sense and logic, in the laudator temporis acti, are fatally liable to get charmed into dire confusion. However, till chronology gets equally confounded, and we take to writing for antiquity, we need not distress ourselves because of knowing more words and phrases than our excellent forefathers.

"Primus sapientiæ gradus est falsa intelligere; secundus, vera cognoscere," says Lactantius; and the reader must have been sufficiently stifled by the choke-damp of folly, to long for emergence into a more wholesome atmosphere.

The phrase 'living language,' used with reference to facts, must import perpetual excretion and accretion of substance, involving or producing assimilation, development, and renewal. No nearer, in the nineteenth century, is English to being a finality than it has been in any previous century; and not even the complete isolation of all the English-speaking peoples, and that seconded by a rigour of despotism undreamt of by very positivists, could avail to give it a definitive form. Countless influences have hitherto contributed to its alteration from age to age, and will always contribute to the same result. As little reason have we to conceit ourselves that our progeny will be satisfied with our English, as the subjects of the Heptarchy would have had for conceiting themselves that their Saxon would supply the necessities of us their descendants. The prejudices of our purists would have been just as defensible in any

former age as they are now; and, if they had been operatively entertained early enough, and widely enough, we should now be talking in monosyllables, and eking out our scantiness of vocalism by nods, shrugs, winks, and other resources of pantomime. A painful compromise, truly, should we have had between the gold of silence and the silver of proper speech. The gold being relinquished for the use of the gods and the commendation of Mr. Carlyle,[1] we may be thankful that we are no worse off than as possessing the silver. It may be that what we have, in the way of mother-tongue, is rather a chaos; but then it is a chaos which comprehends the germs of an approximate cosmos. Already we are much better off than we once were. In bygone days, there was too much of a style of writing which would not have been materially different, if Englishmen had been under oath to make, each independently, their own English; and this style is not yet extinct, though it is something that it now has but few admirers. Neoterisms[2] we must have, however, to the end of

[1] It is not easy for me to write, without a strong sense of loathing, the name of this acrid fantast, and idolizer of brute force,—at best, a bad copy of all that is most objectionable in Hobbes. The word *international*, introduced by the immortal Bentham, and Mr. Carlyle's *gigmanity*,—to coin which, by the way, it was necessary to invent facts,—are significantly characteristic of the utilitarian philanthropist and of the futilitarian misanthropist, respectively.

[2] Siste, lector!—to imitate the invitation on old tomb-stones. And let no one be minded, on the score of my *neoterism*, to hereticate me, as threatening to abet some new-fangled form of religious heterodoxy. Jupiter forbid that I should think of setting up as a theologue. It is just because I would not be confounded with the patrons of *neologism* or *neology*, that I prefer to use *neoterism* and its conjugates. If human affairs were ruled by prudence, the

time; and—such are human imitativeness and ignorance,—the bad are likely to be patronized, by the thoughtless, at least for a season, quite as readily as the good. Let it, therefore, be remembered, if one would innovate on our ordinary speech, that every man who blackens paper may help or may hinder its improvement. Aright or amiss, we cannot but move on. "No author", justly observes Southey, "ever shackled himself by more absurd restrictions,—not even the lipogrammatists, or those who built altars

term *innovation* would be strictly neutral; but, in common usage, as Bentham justly remarks, thereby "expression is given to the sentiment of displeasure." *Neoterism*, as being a vocable still unfamiliar, possesses the advantage of indifference, in not suggesting either praise or dispraise. That it prevents the distraction of mind, and provocation of prejudice, induced by *neologism* or *neology*, with its theological associations, and those associations pregnant with popular repugnance, should, however, alone be enough to recommend it for adoption. And yet, even if it were to win acceptance for a while, it would be a marvel, if it ultimately escaped the fate of *innovation*, and were not degraded so as to be sinisterly suggestive. In order to allow the like of such good fortune, the world must first make most remarkable progress in the direction of energy and consequent unselfishness.

Our comforts and conveniences we are prone to consider as incompatible with any establishments but those under the prevalence of which we enjoy them; and, as we are not sure that change, however it might benefit others, would benefit ourselves, we contend for the continuance of things as they are. In other words, innovation, even in idea, as not being demonstrably for our own good, is to be entertained only to be rejected. I speak, here, for almost all those, their minions and upholders included, who have, in past ages, regulated the thraldom of our species, and who still regulate it. The miserable thing called conservatism, for all its hypocritical appeals to the wisdom of our ancestors, and its other chicaneries and subterfuges, is thus evinced to have sordid and heartless selfishness, the foul offspring of sloth, for its sole foundation. As to language, a prepossession for that to which we are accustomed, and which we have somehow contrived to make answer our needs, grounded on impatience of thinking, will amply account for the aversion felt, by the majority of men, to *conscious deviation* from its stereotyped forms.

and hatched eggs in verse,—than Mr. Fox, when he resolved to use no other words, in his *History*, than were to be found in Dryden.[1] The vocabulary of a living language never can be limited. New words will frequently be set afloat;[2] and, if they are struck

[1] Sir James Mackintosh, also, esteemed Dryden as "the highest authority, in a case of diction, of any single English writer." *Miscellaneous Works* (one-vol. ed., 1851), p. 508, foot-note.

[2] Southey, from the very first, was a prolific word-coiner; and many of his coinages are most felicitous, notwithstanding Coleridge's savage equation: "Southey's English, *i. e.*, no English at all." *Odds and Ends*, No. 19, p. 16.

Sir Walter Scott, in his critique on Southey's *Chronicle of the Cid*, thus touches, and not very wisely, on the translator's alleged passion for odd expressions: "We dare not proceed too far in these censures, because Mr. Southey has informed us, that reviewers, in censuring his introduction of new words, have only shown their own ignorance of the English language. Despite of this 'retort churlish', however, we must say, that, if a word be so old that it has become new again, it is unfit, at least generally speaking, for modern use. We have a title to expect payment in the current coin of the day, and may except against that which bears the effigies of King Cnut, as justly as if it had been struck by Mr. Southey himself." *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 1 (1809), p. 153.

In *The Doctor*, Southey gives himself free scope, as a verbarian, much after the way of Rabelais, Thomas Nash, Taylor the Waterpoet, or Feltham. These are a few of his ventures there: *agathokakological, alamodality, anywhereness, bibliogony, cacodemonize, calvinisticate, circumambagious, cornification, crab-grade*, v. n., *crazyologist, critickin, dendranthropology, disrecommendation, domesticize, errabund, etcæterarist, everywhereness, facsimileship, felisophy, ferrivorous, gelastics, gignitive, hearthstead, herbarism, hippogony, hoplarchy, humorology, iatrarchy, idolify, insomnolence, kittenship, magnisonant, minify, mottocrat, nepotious, obituarist, omni-erudite, omnisignificance, oxmanship, parenthesize, paulopostfuturatively, pentametrize, personificator, philofelist, philotheist, quasically, quintelcment, quizzify, quotationipotent, resemblant, semiramize, shavee, shillishallier, stelliscript, stockinger, theologo-jurist, threnodial, trimestral, typarchical, uglyographize, unegofy, unipsefy, unparallelable, unprosperity, utopianizer, whiskerandoed, zoophilist.*

But, even in the pages of the *Quarterly Review*, he allowed himself in such terms, some of them very good ones, as *abolishment, admonishment, anapaganize, anthropophagistic, anticipant*,

in the mint of analogy, if the standard be lawful, and the die be good, they must become current coin." [1]

Established usage in language is, then, a thing for which philosophy feels no very awful reverence. Far indeed is it from invariably representing the fruit of investigation and reflection. Fashioned by their direction, it would be organic and symmetrical; whereas we see it to be, not unfrequently, reckless and defiant, in fickle alternation, even of everything like method or analogy. Discordant and independent causes, inharmonious forces, acting simultaneously, and usually in competition, must needs have incongruities and compromises as their

---

batracophagous, bastillion, battology, brutalism, carnification, celestialize, comicocratic, conflagratory, cosmocratic, cosmographist, criticaster, debarkation, denegation, denudement, desperating, devilet, devotement, diabolocracy, disaccommodate, donivorous, equalitarian, evangelizationer, exercitation, exute, fizzgig, flocci-naucipilification, floccinaucity, fractionize, grandiloquous, greatening, humgig, illiterature, incarnadine, incommiscible, insititious, macradicalized, malignified, metapolitician, metapolitics, millionist, novitial, orate, perfectionate, perfectionment, possibilitate, proposant, pulpiteer, religioner, resolutioner, saccage, seditionist, sinistrous, spinstership, subalternity, supersaturate, tarriance, taverner, theomisanthropist, unexaggerable, unking, unsweet, ventiduct.

Southey, in his *Colloquies*, the best-written and the silliest of all his prose-works, has *autometry, babblative, dispathy, foliophagous, hagi-heroical, intellectualize, mismeter, nugacious, olfactor, proditorious, scribblative, speechification, torpify.* His letters contain oddities of expression to the amount of several hundred.

Many of his strange words, however, are old.

[1] *Essays, Moral and Political*, Vol. 1, p. 296. The passage which I cite had previously appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 15 (1816), p. 561.

Dr. Johnson is reported to have said: "New words are well-earned riches. When a nation enlarges its stock of knowledge, and acquires new ideas, it must necessarily have a suitable vesture for them." *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 9 (1800), p. 150.

resultants; and of such is language constituted. To take English, there was, first, a prolonged rivalry between its Latin and Anglo-Saxon elements, issuing in a temper between the two. The scholastic predilections of the literate were mitigated by the persistent conservatism of the populace, who, in turn, became measurably habituated, by slow degrees, to the clerkly phraseology of their superiors. And then there were the influences of commerce, of travel, of fashion, and of euphuism, each of which has left its contingent of indelible foot-prints on our speech. Again, and more especially, dating its beginnings about a hundred years back, a consciousness of possessing human rights has gradually come, under philanthropic inspiration, to be a fixed conviction of the commonalty, till then treated as slaves and helots, and taught and believing that they lived only to obey. From this consciousness there has grown, in them, an ever-increasing dissatisfaction with ignorance; many of them have been schooled to think, and to express their thoughts; and a language expands in proportion to the number of those who use it like thoroughly rational beings. With the diffusion of education, solid and superficial, the practice of composition has, of late, increased to limits unprecedented in the world's history. By inevitable consequence, too many, by far, who are but barely qualified to read books to any genuine profit, mistaking their vocation, undertake to write them. Yet the result, though repulsive enough, is not in the least serious. Penny-a-liners and suchlike parcel-learned adventurers have had their fellows in every

age; but no known language has ever suffered from their escapades perceptibly. Shakespeare alone has immortalized ten times more solecisms, — and yet without inducing imitation, to the harm of English, —than all the sciolists of the nineteenth century will contrive to bequeath to posterity.

CHAPTER II.

PROPRIETY IN SPEECH.

Τὸ καλῶς ἔχον που κρεῖττόν ἐστι καὶ νόμου.
Menander.

In nothing are most people at once more heedless and more peremptory than in their decisions as to what is English, or good English, and what is not.[1]

---

[1] A few illustrations, before I go further, may not be amiss. And they shall be taken from Mr. Charles Reade, whose satisfaction with his own English is so well known to all his readers.

"He *don't* hinder you *to sell* yours. Why hinder the poor man *to sell* his?" *The Eighth Commandment*, p. 115.

"One fine afternoon, *everybody* was on deck, amusing *themselves* as *they* could." *Hard Cash* (ed. 1863), Vol. 1, p. 308.

"To while away the time, he got his file of the Times, and *amused himself noting* down the fluctuations of Peruvian bonds." *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 255.

"That is no excuse for *him* beating you." *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 332.

"The writers aforesaid suppress small intermediate matters which, in real life, come, by the score, *between each* brilliant event, &c." *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 224.

"Ah, it is *her* you love." *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 227.

"Not *but what* employment was often bobbed before his eyes; but there was no grasping it." *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 22.

"Who but *he* . . . admired Aileen Aroon?" *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 112.

And who will be so bold as to admit such a collocation as "with him giving", for 'since he gave', to be vernacular?

"*With him giving* her his hand almost at the same moment, she pressed it," &c. *Griffith Gaunt* (ed. 1866), Vol. 1, p. 207.

"I'd have slept, too, if I could; but, *with me going* to chapel, I'm not used to sleep at that time o' day." *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 56.

"So, *with me hearing* 'Mercy, Mercy,' called out after me so many years, I do think the quality hath somehow got under my skin." *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 254.

The accepted criterion of the allowableness of an expression is its currency in good usage; and a man who thinks himself educated is seldom willing to admit that he has not read enough, and that with care and retention enough, to authorize his adjudicating on so very simple a question of fact, whenever it arises. Touching such a matter, not unlike Voltaire's Grand Lama, "il a une plaisante manie; il se croit toujours avoir raison." But, after all, omniscience is not a common endowment; intuition is not always demonstration; memory is a treacherous support; and individual taste is sometimes mistaken, or substituted, for cultured consensus. I well know that the infallibilists, a very numerous body, practically deem quite otherwise, each for himself; and

---

Nor can one admire expressions like *commonsenseadox*, *disclamatory*, *facticide*, *funky*, *peachify*, *picnician*, "instead of *he*", to "*lay* in wait", "*mutual* friend", "polished *to the nine*", "somehow or *another*", "*this* two years".

As being a mongrel, *maniform*, for 'multiform,' has no support in *manifold*; *melancholiac* is not justified by *maniac*; and *senectude* equally does violence to all analogy.

Of one of his mintages Mr. Reade is, apparently, not a little proud.

"The *cephalomant* is he who opposes à priori reasoning, or mere assumption, to direct evidence, present or accessible.

"I coin the word, not out of pedantry, but with a respectable motive." *The Eighth Commandment*, p. 202.

The Greeks might have made κεφαλόμαντις, if they had needed it. But -μαντις becomes, regularly, in English, *-mancer*, and, in French, *-mancien*. As the substantives *chiromantist* and *pseudomantist*, used by the Rev. John Gaule, are abnormal, so is the French *nécromant*; and yet it must be this word that suggested to Mr. Reade the utterly unanalogical *cephalomant*.

And what is the only possible meaning that, according to rule, the word can bear? Why, not 'intuitionalist,' but 'one who divines from inspection of the head;' and such, in one sense, a phrenologist is, at least in claim. Mr. Reade may prudently be counselled to leave the extending of our vocabulary to others.

it is, therefore, only a lowlier class of mortals that I can count on as finding my views acceptable.

In literature, to which even the least skilful of stylists and verbalists have usefully contributed, we meet with books of every degree of artistic merit. But the ill-written greatly exceed, in mass, the well-written; and, again, some writers are, as to manner and diction, conservative, while others are innovative. Moreover, towards settling how we ourselves are to write, the aid is very little that can be derived from such dictionaries as we have at present, and from treatises on grammar and rhetoric. However, unless we choose to stand still, while the rest of the world moves onward, implicit imitation of old models, and conformity to precedents established under conditions no longer subsisting, are not to be universally recommended. What, then, is to be done?

The question, considered comprehensively, of what is proper in language, is not, thus, altogether so simple of decision as, at first sight, it may look. Therein, to take a large view of the subject, we have to deal with a problem the right solution of which depends on the solutions of one or two antecedent problems.

First of all, does man exist for language? The purists constructively imply that he does, at least in their own time. To them, the golden age is past; the efforts of human ingenuity, to any good purpose, are exhausted; and we have nothing to do but walk in the footsteps of those who went before us.[1] It is,

[1] A typical conservative of our day distinctly discourages, by

however, the teaching of common-sense, that language, which man creates, destroys, and renews,

---

implication, as not promising any useful result, all further attempts towards the increase of human knowledge.

"In astronomy, the fields of the sky have not yet, indeed, been ransacked by the most costly instruments; and it may be in store for some of you to announce the existence, or even to analyse the materials, of some luminous point which may be seen two or three times in the course of a century, by any one who will journey to India for the purpose, and, when there, is favoured by the weather. But, for all practical purposes, the stars already named and numbered are as many as we require to hear of; and, if you thoroughly know the visible motions, and clearly conceive the known relations, even of those which can be seen by the naked eye, you will have as much astronomy as is necessary either for the occupation of thought or the direction of navigation." Mr. John Ruskin, *The Eagle's Nest* (1872), p. 68.

The same writer is "certain, that, at this crisis of our national existence, the fixing the minds of young and old upon the customs and conception of chivalry is the best of all moral education." *Ibid.*, p. 231. Things must have come to a pretty pass with the English people, if there be nothing better for them than poetic fictions, chiefly from the work-shop of Sir Walter Scott.

"If you were to ask me who, of all powerful and popular writers in the cause of error, had wrought most harm to their race, I should hesitate, in reply, whether to name Voltaire, or Byron, or the last most ingenious and most venomous of the degraded philosophers of Germany, or, rather, Cervantes." . . . Cervantes "cast scorn upon the holiest principles of humanity." . . . . "Since his time, the purest impulses and the noblest purposes have, perhaps, been oftener stayed by the Devil, under the name of Quixotism, than under any other base name or false allegation." *Lectures on Architecture and Painting*, pp. 66, 67.

And what, according to Mr. Ruskin, have we Americans reached? "Lust of wealth, and trust in it; vulgar faith in magnitude and multitude, instead of nobleness; besides that faith natural to backwoodsmen, *lucum ligna*, perpetual self-contemplation, issuing in passionate vanity; total ignorance of the finer and higher arts, and of all that they teach and bestow; and the discontent of energetic minds unoccupied, frantic with hope of uncomprehended change, and progress they know not whither." *Munera Pulveris* (ed. 1872), pp. 130, 131.

Of these despised creatures we are also there told: "They sent all their best and honestest youths, Harvard University men and the like, to that accursed war; got them nearly all shot; wrote pretty

exists for man. A never-ceasing flux is the very law of its existence. Day by day it loses something;

---

biographies (to the ages of 17, 18, 19) and epithets for them, and so, having washed all the salt out of the nation in blood, left themselves to putrefaction, and the morality of New York."

That, between his spleen and his somnambulism, the elegant Pharisee who can say this is not altogether as other men are, "extortioners," and the like, "or even as this publican," namely, his ideal American, one is prepared to be told. But one is unexpectedly gratified at being assured, as we are assured by no less an authority than himself, that he is "not an unjust person; not an unkind one; not a false one; a lover of order, labour, and peace." *Sesame and Lilies* (ed. 1871), Preface, p. xxvii.

Another conservative, Southey, writes thus of political economists: "What is rent? What is value? Upon these questions, and such as these, which no man of sincere understanding ever proposed to himself or others, they discuss and dilate," &c. *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 44 (1831), p. 277.

Still another, Wordsworth, once sang, and—see Landor's *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 75—has been justly reproved for singing:

> "The mighty moon!
> This way she looks, as if at them,
> And they regard her not!
> O! better wrong and strife;
> Rather vain deeds or evil than such life!"

A not dissimilar Wordsworthian utterance, also now altered, is this:

> —"God's most dreaded instrument,
> In working out a pure intent,
> Is man—arrayed for mutual slaughter:
> Yea, Carnage is His daughter."

Mr. De Quincey's comment on this is significant. "Most heartily, and with my profoundest sympathy, do I go along with Wordsworth in his grand lyrical proclamation of a truth not less divine than it is mysterious, not less triumphant than it is sorrowful, viz., that, amongst God's holiest instruments for the elevation of human nature, is 'mutual slaughter' amongst men,—yes, that 'Carnage is God's daughter.'" *Works* (ed. 1862), Vol. 4, Explanatory Notices, p. viii.

It seems strange that those who entertain such views should not reflect how they, or how those whose conclusions they accept ready-made, come by their notion of God. In an œstrum of vindictive passion, which they regard as a sort of celestial inspiration,

day by day it gains something. To restrain its losses, or to discount its gains, is impossible. Incapable of fixity, if not progressive, it must, of necessity, retrograde and dwindle; and, provided they had their will, those who absolutely resist the introduction of new words would reduce us, sooner or later, to sheer inarticulateness. A return to the condition of Lord Monboddo's protoplastic baboon even the Carlylists, with their theoretic admiration of silence,—and practical incontinence of chatter,—might find it irksome to realize with equanimity.

It is, in a most preponderant proportion, the language we have inherited that we ourselves use, and that we shall transmit to our successors. At our hands it will undergo defalcations; but it will also take on accessions at our hands. As new-born words are constantly offering themselves for recognition, so not only are scattered obsolete words awaiting resurrection, but words the most current are every day on their trial; and, to discover the grounds

---

they simply project themselves, magnified into non-natural dimensions; the ideal monster they, of course, find to be very good; and thenceforward they do worship to it as the adorable Supreme. But they have lordly prelates and suchlike on their side; and so all must be right. "Oh how acceptable a sacrifice to God, above the bloud of bulls and of goates, is the death of a malefactor slaughtered by the hand of justice!" Thus Bishop Sanderson. *Twelve Sermons*, &c. (1637), p. 229.

Fortunately for humanity, no people is half so bad as its theistic idea.

And what is the inference from all this? It is, that there is no conceivable absurdity, frivolity, or cruelty which should surprise us in the thorough-paced conservative, or one who takes his stand on tradition or imitation, as against reason. If the fires of Smithfield were to be rekindled to-morrow by legally constituted authority, there is not, I suppose, one English conservative in a hundred that would raise a dissenting voice.

on which, in extending favour to the first, in renewing it on behalf of the second, and, especially, in withdrawing it from the third, usage bases its arbitraments, baffles, not seldom, our utmost ingenuity of speculation. A little reflection on these facts should suffice to evince the egregious folly of purism, the term by which extreme lingual conservatism is usually, and much too complimentarily, denominated. A modern in toga and sandals would be absurd enough; but a rigid purist is incomparably more absurd. The former would, at the worst, trespass against convenience and conventionality only; but the other, while so trespassing, also consciously puts himself out of fully intelligent relations to those about him, to say nothing of his repellant conceit of superiority.

Purism, I repeat, is a phasis of the principle which assumes that the wisdom of man has spent itself, and which seems to maintain that the world, now in its second childhood, will best employ its senility in sitting with folded hands, and magnifying the sagacity of its vigorous but irrevocable prime. Yet, as we all know, it is we ourselves, not our predecessors, that are really ancient;[1] and the conservative himself seems to acknowledge that we are so; only he allows to us no attribute of old age but its infirmity. Rather, on his theory, until lately, things in general were controlled by a theocracy,—and that not a government by law, but by Almighty Caprice, —now withdrawn; and the living, just so far as they

[1] This truism has, again and again, been pointedly expressed and dilated on, as by Hobbes, Glanvill, Bentham, &c. &c.

signify any proneness to think or to act otherwise than in train, give evidence of their being given over, by the divine displeasure, to themselves, which means, to Satan. As the past was inspired by Heaven, so the present is inspired by the Pit. To the conservative, error, for its very hoariness, is better than truth disfigured by the impress of novelty. Why, then, think of altering our translation of the Bible? Or why revise the Thirty-nine Articles? The bare thought of overhauling the Canon of Scripture is, to the true conservative, heresy, sacrilege, blasphemy, or the sin that shall not be forgiven. Science, except in the shape of pure mathematics, is, in his belief, a subterfuge for escaping from Greek and Latin; and then it makes one uncomfortable about the credit of Adam, and the Old Serpent, and Moses, and Babel, and all that. The rights of man he has gradually grown used, after long years of disquietude, to hear talked of, without apprehension of catalepsy; but you must wait for his son, or for his son's son; if you would get a candid hearing for the rights of woman. New words, too, as they seem to confirm his conviction of our decayed and decaying condition, he frowns at askance, and leaves to the radicals. His port is not presentable, unless bees'-winged; the chief value of his medals lies in their patina; and words, as he judges of them,

"Like statues, moulder into worth."[1]

---

[1] Quite of a piece with the silliness of ultra-purists is that pettiness of mind which sees legitimate ground for personal disparagement in the ventures of foreigners to write our language.

"How many hours of hard labour, during how many years' re*sidence* in this country, did it not cost the learned Westphalian,

Primarily, provided they are recommended by age, all is well and good; but, failing this recommenda-

Ludolph Kuster, a person of great intellectual ability, to acquire the knowledge which he possessed of the English tongue? Yet no one can pass from his Latin letter, in p. 238, to its English postscript, in p. 239, without feeling that the writer has suddenly sunk greatly in his estimation." Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, *The Correspondence of Richard Bentley, D.D.*, Preface, p. 14.

Under favour, I trust that very few persons indeed, not of the class of hopeless parvanimities of the true insular stamp, would be otherwise than heartily ashamed of so feeling. Conceding that Kuster's Latinity is of the purest, let us look at the specimen of his English above referred to.

"P.S. I shal gow, within few days, to Amsterdam, where I shall stay for the other gentlemen deputies from your University for the Francfort jubilee. We went together from Berlin to Hannover; but from thence they went to Hamburg, Bremen, Groningen, etc., for to go Holland, which places I having seen before, I went directly to Holland. Mr. Crownfield shal tel you more by mouth of that which hath passed at Berlin: What gloricus newes have we had lately! To-day we hear here that Ostend hath submitted to King Charles; and, two days ago, there came an express to the Hage, to the Emperor's envoye, who brougth a particular relation of the relief of Barcelona; that the siege was raised the same day when the son was eclipsed; that the french armee was totaly routed, with the loss of 8000 man, which died at the spot; that they left behind tham al their cannons, mortars, bagage, etc.; and that King Philippus escaped narrowly; who, as I hear to-day, is alreadi passed through Montpelier. But of this you must have the news in a short time in Engeland. If you please to answer me, you may direct the letter to Amsterdam, and recommend it to Mr. Halma, who will take care that I may receive it. Vale iterum."

It should be remembered that Kuster was writing to a friend, perhaps in great haste, and, most probably, with no forecast that his English, any more than his Latin, was ever to be printed. Further, at the time when he wrote, little heed was paid, by Englishmen, to the matter of English orthography. His mistakes are, then, not a whit worse than analogous ones would be, if committed in conversation. All things considered, the English of Bentley, everywhere but in his formal compositions, is incomparably more censurable than that of his Prussian correspondent.

Englishmen who professedly and passionately despise their fellow-creatures for the slightest sin against what they themselves esteem to be good usage, or for not having so fresh a memory of

tion, they will, still, be sterling to him, if originated or authenticated by some leader in fashion, politics, or letters. To him, however, all other bases of justification, as regards language, are revolutionary. If you urge, either here or anywhere else, expedience, the motive of reason, he calls you a utilitarian. The greater excommunication being thus denounced against you, there is, of course, an end.

Again, since we cannot choose but have new words, the argument of authority is to be considered. "Tanquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum", was the admonition of Julius Cæsar to the orator;[1] and one might suppose, from the precepts and the practice of many of our would-be literary legislators, that the advice applied indifferently to all mankind, and could admit of no abatement or qualification from time or circumstances. Occasions are, assuredly, easily conceivable, to which this advice would be pertinent, and on which it would be wholesome. At the same time, if taken abstractedly, and for universal application, nothing could be more un-

---

minutiæ as themselves, cross one's path constantly; and it is this their peculiarity of thinking and expressing foul scorn of all but their own apes, which so often makes their society unwelcome to a foreigner. Mr. Ruskin tells us that "a false accent, or a mistaken syllable, is enough, in the parliament of any civilized nation, to assign to a man a certain degree of inferior standing for ever." *Sesame and Lilies* (ed. 1871), pp. 18, 19.

No locus penitentiæ, be it observed, is provided for the unfortunate barbarian who, perhaps from having been long exclusively absorbed in the wisest thoughts of the wisest men, or from having been engaged, as a traveller, in studying distant nations, happens to be unacquainted with the fashion of the hour in, for instance, laying the stress on the antepenult of a word, and not on its penult.

[1] See Aulus Gellius, Book 1, Ch. 10; and compare Macrobius, *Saturn.*, Book 1, Ch. 5.

wise, not to say futile. The simple reasons are, that no expression was ever yet used which some one had not to handsel, and that we not only may, but must, continue to do what the world has always been doing. Does, then, the warrant of a single person validate a neoterism,[1] or, what is scarcely distinguishable therefrom, a resuscitated obsoletism? In reply, it may be asked, How can we ever know that, before any given new expression meets our own eyes, it may not already have been accepted by hundreds who know how to discriminate what is acceptable? Furthermore, though not yet so accepted, why may there not be a something about it which will secure its eventual acceptance? Justly viewed, and by those that can discern, the first of these questions is of very little importance. Everything now established was once unestablished, and the very latest of novelties. It is not the ponderation of personal evidence for or

[1] Dr. Parr, having, in 1789, written *remarker*, subjoins this note on it: "I am not quite satisfied with this word, though Johnson, in his *Dictionary*, affixes to it the authority of Watts. I use it from necessity, or, at least, for the sake of avoiding the tiresome periphrasis of saying 'the writer of the remarks.'" *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 377. Colman had used the word in 1765. See *Prose on Several Occasions*, Vol. 2, p. 69.

A little before, at p. 361, Dr. Parr thus annotates his own *inveterate*: "The authorities of Fletcher and Bacon protect the word *inveterate* from the charge of Latinism."

It appears, accordingly, that, in Dr. Parr's opinion, a single known authority for a word leaves its propriety doubtful, but that two known authorities for a word attest it competently. This is a fair specimen of the imbecile ratiocination of purists.

As to *inveterate*, besides having long been, when Parr hesitated at it, most familiar in its classical sense, it had already come to signify, in popular speech, as it still signifies, 'virulent.' Henry Brooke wrote, in 1760: "He was informed, in terms the most aggravating and *inveterate*, of the whole course and history of Ned's misbehaviour." *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 2, p. 84.

against a word that should accredit or discredit it. If it stands firmly on its own basis, it is vouched for, as eligible, in its own right. Let it, however, be examined with all rigour, before being favourably pronounced upon and patronized. And let its examiner first examine himself as to his qualifications for sitting in judgment on it. Quite possibly, it is much the safest plan for him to do his thinking, on such a matter, as on most others, by proxy. Nay, it may even be, that, while he plumes himself on his philology, he is no better than a duplicate of Mr. Richard Grant White.

To enumerate and criticize all the verbal and expressional solecisms which disfigure our literature would be an undertaking of enormous labour, and yet of only very partial utility. Even suppose that these solecisms were collected, and were characterized, one after another, as militating against analogy,[1] or as superfluous, ambiguous, vulgar, affected, and so on, and the reasons given for thus characterizing them; still, a large majority of speakers and writers, from defect of memory, from insufficient learning, or from incapacity to grasp and to apply principles, would, either of their own motion, or in imitation of others, go on solecizing pretty much as before. A diligent and scrupulous adherence to approved models is, therefore, for most persons, not only the best lesson to learn, but the only lesson they are able to learn; and, after all, it will be prudent, in them, not

[1] Analogy, taken in its greatest latitude, is a term which, as applied to language, embraces, with other things, euphony; and our notions of English euphony largely preclude not only long *words but harsh ones.*

to think they have learnt it otherwise than very imperfectly, until they shall have taken counsel with their better-informed associates. As they would avoid sailing the good ship Language without rudder or compass, they would do well to forswear everything like independence altogether. Humility and self-distrust, though often hypocritically overdone, embrace, for most people, the germs of virtue. Besides, how bountifully have Providence and the wisdom of our ancestors[1] provided us with popes,

---

[1] The sapience of our forefathers and the defectiveness of our dictionaries are simultaneously illustrated by the bead-roll of matæology embodied in the extract here following.

"What difference betwixt *astromancy*, *magomancy*, or *magastromancy*,—as touching a sorcerous both superstition and operation,—and all these after-named? *viz.*, *stareomancy* [read *stæcheiomancy*], or divining by the elements; *aeromancy*, or divining by the ayr; *pyromancy*, by fire; *hydromancy*, by water; *geomancy*, by earth; *theomancy*, pretending to divine by the revelation of the Spirit, and by the Scriptures or Word of God; *demonomancy*, by the suggestions of evill demons or devills; *idolomancy*, by idolls, images, figures; *psychomancy*, by men's souls, affections, wills, religious or morall dispositions; *antinopomancy* [read *enteropomancy*], by the entrails of men, women, and children; *theriomancy*, by beasts; *ornithomancy*, by birds; *ichthyomancy*, by fishes; *botanomancy*, by herbs; *lithomancy*, by stones: *cleromancy*, by lotts; *oneiromancy*, by dreams; *onomatomancy*, by names; *arithmancy*, by numbers; *logarithmancy*, by logarithmes; *sternomancy*, from the breast to the belly; *gastromancy*, by the sound of, or signes upon, the belly; *omphalomancy*, by the navell; *cheiromancy*, by the hands; *podomancy*, by the feet; *onychomancy*, by the nayles; *cephalonomancy*, by brayling of an asse's head; *tephramancy*, by ashes; *capnomancy*, by smoak; *libanomancy*, by burning of frankincence; *ceromancy*, by melting of wax; *lecanomancy*, by a basin of water; *catoptromancy*, by looking-glasses; *chartomancy*, by writing in papers; *macheromancy*, by knives or swords; *crystallomancy*, by glasses; *dactyliomancy*, by rings; *coscinomancy*, by seives; *axinomancy*, by sawes [axes]; *cottabomancy*, by vessells of brasse or other metall; *roadomancy* [read *rhabdomancy*], by starres [staves]; *spatilomancy*, by skins, bones, excrements; *sciomancy*, by shadowes;

priests, philologists, and other procurators, specialists, and experts! And how melancholy would be their outlook, if, as a rule, we preferred the flickering glimmer of our own profane rushlights to the noonday effulgence of their consecrated illumination! To whatever is most current in language, to phraseology as yet purely tentative, and to all that intervenes between the two, the argument of these tritest of reflections applies with equal cogency.

If the doctor is to be believed, my neighbour is suffering from idiopathic hæmatemesis; a callow student of theology confesses that he is fairly gravelled by the hypostatic circumincession; and a mathematician, with his emotions under imperfect control, rises into raptures about the properties of equian-

---

astragalomancy, by dice; *œnomancy*, by wine; *sycomancy*, by figgs; *tyromancy*, by the coagulation of cheese; *alphitomancy*, by meal, flower, or branne; *crithomancy*, by grain or corn; *alectoromancy*, by cocks or pullen; *gyromancy*, by rounds or circles; *lampadomancy*, by candles and lamps; and, in one word for all, *nagomancy* [read *necyomancy*] or *necromancy*, by inspecting, consulting, and divining by, with, or from, the dead." John Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, *The Magastromancer, or the Magicall-astrologicall Diviner, Posed and Puzzled* (1652), pp. 165, 166.

Gaule, whose curious and amusing book, apparently dashed off in white-hot rage, has no table of errata, perhaps wrote an indistinct hand, and certainly did not read his proof-sheets. Several minor misprints in the preceding extract I have corrected silently; as, for instance, *typomancy*, for *tyromancy*. Considered philologically, *arithmancy* and *logarithmancy* are as lawless as the practices which the words denote are fatuous.

Dr. Roget, in his *Thesaurus*, gives, under *judicial astrology*, the names of numerous false sciences. His list, though not so full as Gaule's, supplements it by sixteen absurdities, among which are *chaomancy*, *halomancy*, and *psephomancy*. From other sources I have gleaned *anthropomancy*, *cubomancy*, *palomancy*, and *rhapsodomancy*.

Of the terms here specified, no fewer than thirty-one have escaped Dr. Webster's editors.

harmonic hexastigmata. Are not these masters of hyperpolysyllabic sesquipedalianism using proper language? Heaven forfend that any one should suppose they were not, or that they should be deprived of so much as a single short vowel. To Roger Stubbs they will be as unintelligible as O'Connell, with his rectangular parallelopipedon, was to the fishwife. If they use such language, they might as well address Roger in Hottentotese or Kamschadalian. Yet they are in the right, for all that. Whether this way of delivering their meaning would be everywhere and always appropriate is quite another thing. But, fortunately, there are occasions and occasions; and it would bring us to a beggarly sort of talk indeed, if we had always to conform our expressions to a canon imitated, even in its "ubique" and "ab omnibus", from that of St. Vincent of Lerins. Language may be at once perfectly correct and ludicrously inappropriate. Experience and tact instruct us when it is appropriate; but scholarship alone can enable us to estimate its correctness. On the one hand, we study nothing beyond adapting ourselves to circumstances; on the other hand, whenever we deviate—though we should never deviate save expedientially—from accepted usage, a strict observance of analogy, and of analogy taken in its most comprehensive acceptation,[1] is invariably indispensable.[2]

---

[1] See the note in p. 36, *supra*.

[2] This is the creed inculcated, for general guidance, by all philologists but those of the transcendental school, gentlemen that hold converse with some one beyond the clouds, who settles how men and women should speak, much better than they

By accepted usage in speech we understand that which is practised, or approved, consentiently and

---

can settle the question themselves. This mysterious arbiter, stripped of his disguise, turns out, however, to be only a dexterous metamorphosis of personal conceit or caprice. Our lexicographers are, to a man, transcendentalists, on occasion.

Take Dr. Johnson, for instance. *Excepting*, as a preposition, he calls "improper"; and *smoothen* is, to him, "bad". On the other hand, *womanize*, he legislates, though "not used", is "proper".

Now, judged analogically, *excepting* and *smoothen* are as good as *saving* and *roughen;* but, as to *womanize*, if it be "proper", why should not *manize*, *boyize*, and *girlize* be so? Referring to usage, we find we have excellent authority for *excepting;* for *smoothen*, — used, I find, by Howell, in his *Twelve Several Treatises*, &c. (1661), p. 375,—only the authority of "mechanics", to Dr. Johnson's knowledge; and the sole writer whom he cites for *womanize* is Sir Philip Sidney. Thus we see, that words, as he viewed them, though ever so well supported by good usage, may be "improper"; again, that their strictest conformity to rule is not enough, unless they are countenanced by the polite world, to keep them from being "bad"; and, further, that, though their formation is warranted by an analogy but little better than non-existent, a single favourite author stamps them, by admission into his pages, as "proper".

In *The Plan of an English Dictionary*, Johnson propounds, as one of his maxims: "Barbarous, or impure, words and expressions may be branded with some note of infamy; as they are carefully to be eradicated, wherever they are found; and they occur, too frequently, even in the best writers". And immediately after this follow specimens, one of which is the line from Pope:

> "*'T is these* that early taint the female soul".

Here, once more, we have him setting up his own private whim as law. *'T is these*, or *it is these*, and like expressions, had been in use, in his time, some two centuries, at least, and had become ineradicably established. "*It is they*". Bishop Bale, *Kynge Johan* (before 1563), p. 30 (ed. 1838). "*'T is we.*" Samuel Rowlands (1600—12?), *The Four Knaves*, p. 43 (ed. 1844). What Johnson took to be the more grammatical expression than Pope's —as the "*they are they*" in *St. John*, 5, 39,—was quite given up, and hopeless of resuscitation; but *'t is these*, as not suiting his speculative notions of syntax, was not to be allowed; and, consequently, nothing but an awkward and inadequate periphrasis

advertently,[1] by the best writers and speakers of any given time.[2] And what is to be said of such usage, as a precedent for guidance? The advice to the world at large is, after being at all pains to find out what it is, to take up with it. But the learned never will be, as they never have been, so easily satisfied. Points of grammar left out of question, they know that accepted usage in speech, contemplated as a whole, with its large basis of ignorance, and its frequent violence of analogy, deserves no better epithet than that of tolerable. Hence their proposals of improvement on what, to their discontent, they find established: and, in demonstration that they do wisely to innovate, many an expedient of theirs, now in the way of addition, and now in the way of substitution, is seen to become, eventually, a fixture.[3]

---

remained as available. With *it is these* he must, necessarily, proscribe *it is those, it is they, it is we, it is you, it was men*, &c. &c. In these phrases he has to do, as he puts it, with what is "barbarous", or else with what is "impure"; for they were not, in his day, obsolete. His professed preference for pre-Restoration English ought to have reconciled him to them, if he had not been utterly inconsistent and unscientific.

[1] These qualificatives are necessary; for Landor well observes: "Good writers are authorities for only what is good, and by no means, and in no degree, for what is bad, which may be found even in them." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 207.

It is because of these facts, and not from inconsistency, that I do not hesitate to challenge, on some occasions, in my support, an author whom, on other occasions, I arraign for going, in his less wise moods, more or less completely astray.

[2] "Consuetudinem sermonis vocabo consensum eruditorum, sicut vivendi consensum bonorum." Quintilian, I., 4.

[3] In the fourth chapter I give a noteworthy list of expressions used by Hamon L'Estrange, which, if his critic, Heylin, may be trusted, though deemed amenable to censure, as pedantic novelties, about the middle of the seventeenth century, are now, for the most part, of everyday occurrence.

CHAPTER III.

INTUITIVE PHILOLOGY.

Una dia es siempre maestro del otro; y contra lo que si scribe oy, estarà mañana quien sabe mas.—*Mendoza.*

ADDISON confidently alleges that Milton minted the word *miscreated.*[1] Yet it occurs in Spenser, with the shorter form *miscreate;* and the latter is employed by Shakespeare, also.

"*Elate* is a participle; but there is no such word as 'to *elate*', I imagine." So wrote Gray, in 1760;[2] and his imagination ill supplied the place of research.[3]

---

[1] *The Spectator*, No. 285. "Authors are often praised for improvement, or blamed for innovation, with very little justice, by those who read few other books of the same age. Addison himself has been so unsuccessful in enumerating the words with which Milton has enriched our language, as, perhaps, not to have named one of which Milton was the author." Dr. Johnson, *Proposal for Printing the Works of Shakespeare.*

[2] *Works* (ed. Mitford, 1858), Vol. 5, p. 209. Gray's verbal criticisms, almost without exception, betray very limited reading, or else a miserable memory. I return to this point in the next chapter.

[3] The references which follow are only a few to what I might give. William Watson, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions* (1602), pp. 105, 139. Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), p. 210. Thomas Gainsford (1618), in *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 564. Feltham, *Resolves, Divine, Moral, Political* (ed. 1628), First Centurie, p. 88; Second Cent., p. 12. Brathwait, *The Lives of All the Roman Emperors* (1636), p. 354. Howell, *Dodona's Grove* (1640), pp. 195, 206. Fleckno, *A Relation of Ten Years Travells* (1655), p. 131. Fuller, *The Appeal of Injured Innocence*, &c. (1659), Part 3, p. 61. Henry More, *Mystery of Iniquity* (ed. 1664), pp. 147, 148, 149. Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), p. 153. Trans. of

Having used the word *succedaneous*, William Taylor thus comments on it: "We are writing on coins. May we not coin a word?"[1] On certain conditions, most assuredly; only the vocable in question had been used by Sir Thomas Browne, Robert Boyle, Henry More,[2] and Dr. Johnson.[3]

Taylor further states, that Burke first employed the word *entirety*.[4] In the form *entierty*, it occurs in Bacon. And he strangely censures *to count on*, as a foreign idiom.[5]

Sir James Mackintosh[6] speaks of "Parr's new-coined word *syllogize*." It has been used, every now and then, since the fifteenth century.[7]

According to Mr. Isaac D'Israeli, "we still want *incuriosity*"[8]. He meant, that it was not noticed by

---

Il Nipotismo, &c. (1673), Part 2, p. 163. Barrow, *Works* (ed. 1683—92), Vol. 3, p. 193. Bishop Warburton (1724), *Tracts by Warburton*, &c., p. 36. Henry Brooke (1735), *Universal Beauty*, Book 2, l. 17. Miss Westcomb (1750), *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 274. Dr. Johnson (1750—52), *The Rambler*, Nos. 26, 66, 91, 133, 142, 148, 154, 180, 182, 193; &c. &c. Tilson, *The World* (1756), No. 167.

[1] *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 79 (1816), p. 506.

[2] *Mystery of Godliness* (ed. 1660), p. 113; *Mystery of Iniquity*, p. 488: *Annotations upon Lux Orientalis*, &c. (1682-3), p. 206.

[3] *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, Castle of Col.

[4] *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 27 (1798), p. 542.

[5] *Ibid.*, Vol. 17 (1795), p. 311. [6] *Life*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 141.

[7] See Bp. Pecock's *Repressor* (1456), pp. 76, 78. Other vouchers are here indicated. Cowley, *Cutter of Coleman-street*, Act 4, Sc. 4. Barrow, *Works* (ed. 1683—92), Vol. 3, p. 124. Sir Thomas Urquhart, Translation of *Rabelais* (ed. 1694), Vol. 1, p. 176. Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 1, Ch. 16; Vol. 4, Ch. 40. Dr. Johnson quotes Baker and Watts for it.

[8] *Curiosities of Literature*, Chapter entitled *History of New Words*. Mr. D'Israeli there calls the French *démoralisation* a "barbarous term". By this we are only to understand that he disrelished the political principles of its reputed author.

Dr. Johnson. It is used by Jeremy Taylor, and by many writers of subsequent date.[1]

"Let me claim the honour of one pure neologism", again writes Mr. D'Israeli.[2] "I ventured to introduce the term of *father-land*, to describe our natale solum. I have lived to see it adopted by Lord Byron and by Mr. Southey; and the word is now common." The affected expression *father-land* was spoken of by Sir William Temple,[3] as long ago as 1672.

"Notwithstanding a repugnance to neologisms in common speech", writes Mr. Samuel Bailey,[4] "there is one which, as I am in a commercial district, I

Archbishop Trench, in like manner, speaks of "the monstrous birth, *denominationalism*". *English Past and Present*, Lecture 2. There is no necessity, except for the sake of the uninitiated, to supply the sacerdotal subaudition: "Monstrous birth, of course; seeing that I entertain for dissenters the same description of apostolic love that St. Paul entertained for Alexander the coppersmith." *Establishmentarianism*, all the more grateful for its "linked sweetness long drawn out", was, however, wont, no doubt, to roll over the prelatial tongue, as the most savoury of polysyllables. In the good old days of unredressed Irish wrongs, it must have been, to His Grace, a source of quite as much refreshing and comfort as the crone of the old story derived from her favourite *Mesopotamia*.

[1] See Dr. Richardson's *Dictionary*, and Archdeacon Todd's additions to Dr. Johnson's. To the authorities named by them I may add Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (ed. 1656), p. 9: *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), p. 18.

The synonymous *incuriousness* I have one additional old authority for,—Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία (1652), p. 192.

Heylin's animadversion on *incurious*, as being a novelty, I refer to in the next chapter. See, for the word, Donne, *Biathanatos* (1st ed.), p. 205; Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, p. 52; Trans. of *Il Cardinalismo*, &c. (1670), p. 11: Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign*, &c., pp. 5, 92. L'Estrange, in the same work, uses *incuriously* at pp. 53, 82.

[2] *Curiosities of Literature, ubi supra.*

[3] "The Dutch, by expressions of dearness, instead of 'our country', say 'our *father-land*'." *Miscellanea* (ed. 1697), Part 1, p. 66.

[4] *Discourses on Various Subjects* (1852), p. 77.

would venture to propose, and to which I think good taste might soon be reconciled. At present, it is common to use the participle *manufacturing* as an adjective, in such phrases as 'the agricultural and *manufacturing* interests', which is awkward enough. From this awkwardness the introduction of the legitimately formed word *manufactural* would relieve us." William Taylor had printed the expression "*manufactural* demand", nearly half a century before.[1]

Mr. G. P. Marsh writes of "*semeiology*, if I may coin a word for the occasion".[2] But, in 1694, Peter Motteux, in a very popular book, printed: "These ways of signifying our thoughts by gestures, called, by the learned Bishop Wilkins, *semæology*".[3]

A writer in the *Saturday Review* says[4], in a critique on Landor's *Hellenics:* "We have words used in senses altogether unprecedented; as *sepulture*, for 'sepulchre'," &c. Now, *sepulture* has been used, in this sense, by Gower[5], Capgrave[6], Sir Thomas Elyot[7],

---

[1] *The Annual Review*, Vol. 4 (1806), p. 38.

[2] *Lectures on the English Language*, foot-note to p. 34.

[3] Urquhart's *Rabelais*, Vol. 1, Preface, p. 98.

[4] Vol. 9 (1860), p. 250. Unless appearances are fallacious, this notorious exponent of the conceit, insolence, and pruriency of cultured Young England is nearing the end of its career. And the end of its career, if realized, will be significant for good.

It is a curious phenomenon which the rising generation of Englishmen so largely exhibit, in oscillating between High Church and the Cities of the Plain.

[5] For this reference, and that to Holinshed, see Dr. Richardson's *Dictionary*, where, however, the quotations are misunderstood.

[6] *Chronicle of England*. p. 6. Capgrave died in 1464.

[7] "Marius . . . . also caused Caius Cæsar . . . . to be vyolently drawen to the *sepulture* of one Varius, a simple and seditious person,

Holinshed, Stow[1], Mabbe[2], Lithgow[3], Brathwait[4], and Sir Thomas Browne[5]; and even Charles Lamb[6] and Cardinal Wiseman[7] have ventured it.

"*Alone*, in the sense of 'only'," has recently been classed[8] among the trespasses of "pretentious blunderers, for whom the legitimate resources of our incomparable English language would seem to be insufficient." The subjoined references demonstrate that this sense of *alone* is no novelty[9]. As to its

---

and there to bee dishonestlye slayne", &c. *The Governour* (1531), fol. 100 (ed. 1580).

[1] *Annales* (ed. 1615), p. 45.

[2] "My money was the price of bloud: it was spent upon *sepultures* for dead bodies, on dead workes, and worldly vices". *The Rogue* (ed. 1623), Part 2, p. 213.

[3] "We saw . . . also the *sepultures* of David and of his sonne Salomon". *The Totall Discourse*, &c. (ed. 1632), p. 248.

[4] "Hee [Maxentius] was . . throwne and drowned in the river Tyber, ... having no other *sepulture* then the river". *The Lives of All the Roman Emperors*, p. 148.

[5] *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (ed. 1658), p. 24. The passage referred to is quoted by Dr. Johnson, in illustration of the only meaning which he, like other lexicographers, gives of *sepulture*, "interment, burial". Evidently, he has mistaken the sense of the word in this place; and he has, further, corrupted "their sepultures" into "her sepultures"; and Archdeacon Todd and Dr. Latham reprint this false reading.

Mr. Simon Wilkin, in his elegant edition of Browne, has *sepulchres*, which reading appears, for the first time, in the edition of 1686, the earliest published after the author's death.

The Latin *sepultura*, the Italian *sepoltura*, and the French *sépulture* have, all, 'grave', for one of their meanings.

[6] *The Last Essays of Elia, Amicus Redivivus.*

[7] *Fabiola*, p. 157. Mr. G. P. Marsh, too, uses *sepulture*, for 'burial-place', in his *Man and Nature* (1864), p. 76, foot-note.

[8] By Mr. John Fiske, in *The North American Review*, Vol. 109 (1869), p. 315, foot-note.

[9] "Jesus Christe, our *alone* Saviour and Redemer". Phillip Stubbes, *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1585), p. 229 (ed. 1836).

Want of space forbids my giving at length the passages about to be indicated. Samuel Hieron, *Works* (ed. 1624), Vol. 1, pp. 108, 133, 169, 689, 696, 708, &c. John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justi-*

currency, I doubt whether, since it first of all came into vogue, it has ever been wholly in abeyance[1].

---

fication, &c. (1642), p. 212. Edward Terry, *A Voyage to East-India* (ed. 1665), p. 293. Timothy Puller, *The Moderation of the Church of England*, &c. (1679), p. 20 (ed. 1843). Bp. Sanderson, *Sermons* (ed. 1681), Vol. 1, pp. 12, 60, 173, 215, 314.

"A poeme is not alone any worke or composition of the poet's, in many or few verses; but even one *alone* verse sometimes makes a perfect poeme". Ben Jonson, *Timber, What meane you by a Poeme?*

The prepositive *alone* objected to by Mr. Fiske should, as is seen, have been defined by 'sole', 'single', as well as by 'only'.

"I can assure you it was sport *alone*, and was able to make as many as beheld it to breake their hearts with laughing, to see", &c. Mabbe, *The Rogue*, &c. (ed. 1623), Part 2, p. 315.

In this passage, as in several in Shakespeare, *alone*, postpositive, has the peculiar sense of 'above all things', 'unique', 'without comparison'.

With the uses of *alone*, noted above, compare the uses of *only* in the following extracts.

"But, as for the five laste, love, labor, gladnes to learne of others, boldnes to aske doutes, and will to wynne praise, be [*i. e.*, they are] wonne and maintened by the *onelie* wisedome and discretion of the scholemaster". Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (1570), p. 42 (ed. 1870).

"Speach is not naturall to man, saving for his *onely* habilitie to speake", &c. Puttenham, p. 119.

"This *only* coale is enough to kindle the fire". Mabbe, *The Rogue*, Part 2, p. 261.

"Infants . . are onely charged with *onely* original sin". Hamon L'Estrange, *The Alliance*, &c., p. 239.

In these extracts, *only* means 'mere'; in those to come, 'sole', a sense we still give it,—but with strange restriction,—as in 'an *only* son', &c.

"Wonderfull cost was bestowed by Aramanthus, who had the *onely* orderyng of the matter". Barnabe Riche, *Farewell to Militarie Profession* (1581), p. 183 (ed. 1846).

"Choice and select fashions are there in *onely* request". Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, &c. (ed. 1641), p. 309.

Latimer wrote, in 1549: "Then lette us truste upon hys *onelye* death, and looke for none other sacrifice propiciatorye", &c. *Fourth Sermon* (ed. 1868), pp. 33, 34. "*Onelye* death" is here equivalent to 'death *alone*.'

[1] At the beginning of this century, a shallow English critic, the Rev. Mr. Boucher, having quoted from a pamphlet the clause "made

Rash and erroneous utterances of the same sort as these bestrew our modern literature in great plenty. Nay, even among our professed critics of language, those who have not compromised their character for caution and accuracy, by adding to the already existent mass of them, are signally exceptional. Nothing can be more hazardous than to pronounce that a given word has never before been used, or that it has never before borne a certain signification. Nor is it, by any means, always safe to assert that a word or phrase came, originally, from the American side of the Atlantic. As we are not now specially concerned with Americanisms, two or three illustrations of this position may suffice.

As recently as 1856, a contributor to *Notes and Queries*,[1] in the course of an excursion through a Kentucky newspaper, encountered the expression *in our midst*, seized upon the, to him, new-born monster,

---

Dr. Franklin the *alone* minister", condemned it as blemished by an Americanism. Dr. Worcester replied to this, hastily, that "it would, probably, be as difficult to find, in an American, as in an English, writer, another instance in which *alone* is used in the same manner as in the pamphlet cited". *Dictionary* (ed. 1860), p. li. The Doctor forgot, that, in his edition of Johnson's *Dictionary* abridged (1845), p. 1035, he had referred to the Rev. J. Newton, and to Dr. Chalmers, for locutions like "the *alone* method of salvation". To these modern authorities I may add John Wesley, who writes of "the *alone* merits of our Lord Jesus Christ". Southey's *Life of Wesley* (ed. 1864), Vol. 2, p. 174.

Phraseology of this kind may often be heard from so-called evangelical English pulpits, and met with in the printed literature of the occupants of those pulpits. The self-accommodating Bp. Wilberforce, when, a few years ago, he wrote of "the *alone* Saviour", was ridiculed, in that, when he cleansed his skirts of Low-churchism, he did not fully unlearn its characteristic jargon.

[1] Second Series, Vol. 1, p. 9.

and that an American monster, and benevolently volunteered himself as its showman. Dr. Worcester, under the date of 1860, informs us that "*our midst, their midst*, &c. are of recent introduction"; Mr. G. P. Marsh[1] stigmatizes these phrases as "vulgarisms", "now unhappily very common", and as "gross solecisms", "unsupported by the authority of pure idiomatic English writers"; and Dr. Webster's editors declare that they "seem contrary to the genius of our language", and follow suit to Mr. Marsh in his pathos over them. The fact is, however, that *in their midst* existed in the fourteenth century; and it is no wonder that, on being introduced to the nineteenth century, it has met with rebuffs. If, though certified as our veritable ancestors, even the good old men and wives of five hundred years ago were suddenly to drop in on us, with their quaint style of talk, their uncouth way of feeding, and the phenomenal cut of their garments, it is more than likely that we should look askance at the ancient worthies, and wish that some one would take them out of sight and hearing, and see them quietly hushed up. The phrase *in her middis*, that is to say, *in their midst*, occurs in the *Apology for Lollard Doctrines*[2], a work written by one of Wicliffe's contemporaries, if not by Wicliffe himself.[3] That *in their*

[1] *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 396, foot-note. At p. 645, he writes of "the vulgarism of such phrases as *in our midst*," &c.

[2] P. 12. This work is edited by Dr. J. H. Todd.

[3] Mr. Marsh has taken the trouble to ascertain that the Wicliffite translators nowhere use *in their midst*, &c.; and some may be disposed to accept this fact as well nigh availing, of itself, to abjudicate the *Apology for Lollard Doctrines* from Wicliffe. At p. 74 of the *Apology*, we find "by *was* occasion",—meaning 'by occasion of

midst, in our midst, &c. are at odds with the "genius" of our language is an assertion somewhat adventurous. As concerns a substantive, its subjective genitive, universally, and its objective genitive, very often, may be expressed prepositively. *Love of God*, intending 'love emanating from God,' may be exchanged for *God's love;* but we also say *Plato's commentators* and *the world's end.* To come to possessive pronouns, we have no scruples about the objective *do his pleasure, sing thy praise, in my absence, on your account, to their discredit, in our despite, his equal*, &c. &c.;[1] and with these phrases *in our midst* is rigidly comparable. "The possessive pronoun cannot be properly applied,

---

whom',—which is Wicliffite; but can we believe that Wicliffe himself could derive *priest* from *præsse?* For Dr. Todd pretty clearly shows, at p. 119, that it is so derived by the Apologist.

And this reminds me of an etymology of *presbyter*, given, by Henri Estienne, from the *Stella Clericorum*, "Presbyter dicitur quasi præbens iter", an amendment to which was waggishly proposed, by some one, in "Presbyter, quasi præ aliis bibens ter." Of the same stamp, at least scientifically considered, is the analysis of *diabolus*, adopted by Olivier Maillard, and doubtfully credited to Hugo Carrensis: "Diabolus, ex dia, quod est duo, et bolus, id est, morcellus; quasi faciens duos bolos de corpore et anima." *Apologie pour Herodote* (1566), Vol. 2, pp. 42—44 (ed. 1735).

[1] "There was nothyng might content her but *his presence and sweete sight.*" Barnabe Riche, *Farewell*, &c., p. 69.

"After so many dayes spent in *her continuall conversation*, he remained in the same state as he did the very first day, neither better nor worse." Mabbe, *The Rogue*, Part 1, p. 76.

This we should not say now; and yet *in her company* would strike no one as being odd.

"We intermeddle not with *her description*, as she was a sovereign prince too high", &c. Fuller, *The Holy State*, &c. (ed. 1841), p. 293.

"Go, my angel, said Mr. Clinton, and take yonder seat, that I may view and delight my soul with *your sight*, at leisure." Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 5, p. 246.

"Forgotten he was not; for *his prosecution* was not ordered." Dr. *Johnson, Life of Milton.*

except as indicative of possession or appurtenance," is the rule laid down by Mr. Marsh, seemingly in forgetfulness of the familiar modes of speech just specified. With reference to analogical principles, *in our midst* is altogether irreproachable; and, in future, if any one dislikes it, he will do prudently, if he does no more than pass by on the other side, and leave it to itself.

"Did you see *The Examiner* on Mrs. Stowe's *Sunny Memories?* *Quite* a severe article; and *quite* unnecessarily so, I should say. The use of *quite* is a peculiarity which I *quite* remarked, myself; but I think you have *quite* a right to use it, as a substitute, if you please, for our less exact 'very'; and, in colloquial writing, no one ought to object. I don't see that the old-country English are to have the exclusive right of introducing new expressions."

Thus wrote Mr. Arthur Hugh Clough,[1] though the uses of *quite* which he exemplifies,—save, perhaps, in the phrase "I *quite* remarked,"[2]—have been English for considerably upwards of a hundred years.[3] Nor

---

[1] *Poems and Prose Remains* (1869), Vol. 1, p. 219.

[2] Who would say "I *quite* remarked", whether to intend 'I *particularly* remarked', or anything else? Possibly, some of the writers, all of them English, quoted in the next note. According to Mr. Clough, "I *quite* remarked" is for 'I *very* remarked', which is nothing. And is "*quite* a right" for '*very* a right'?

[3] "'T is become *quite* reputable." Gay, *The Distressed Wife*, Act 3, Scene 8.

"And you say they are *quite* loving?" Carey, *The Honest Yorkshireman* (1736), Act 2, Scene 7.

"*Quite* a rake." Richardson, *Pamela* (ed. 1811), Vol. 1, p. 86.

"But he is *quite* displeased, it seems." *Id.*, *Clarissa Harlowe* (ed. 1811), Vol. 4, p. 206.

"They want for nothing, and are grown *quite* religious." *Id.*, *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1811), Vol. 6, p. 270.

is *quite*, in any of his instances, exactly equivalent, as he intimates it is, to 'very'. As to "*quite a* severe

---

"With regard to his stucco-work within doors, he is *quite* extravagant." "*Quite* impatient to converse with you." Shenstone, *Letters*, Nos. 64 and 107.

"These menaces . . sometimes make me *quite* angry." Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 84.

The four next extracts were written in 1745, 1754, 1766, and 1774.

"I am *quite* interested in the fate of your favourite trees," &c. Miss Talbot, *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 109.

"To wish anybody a merry Christmas, in the old phrase, would be *quite* an absurdity." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 189.

"Mars . . . . . throws *quite* a lustre on the waves." Miss Carter, *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 300.

"It seems to me *quite* an age that I have deferred it." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 107.

"I *quite* longed for you to share my admiration of it." "There will be *quite* a knot of nobility in the neighbourhood this autumn." *Id.*, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 2, p. 67; Vol. 3, p. 168. Also see Vol. 1, pp. 74, 106, 314; Vol. 2, pp. 34, 203; Vol. 3, pp. 219, 221, 228.

"It was *quite* early." Edward Moore, *The World*, No. 97.

Lady Echlin wrote, in 1757: "The little wonder was *quite* a new scene to him." *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, Vol. 5, p. 79. Here, as in several of my extracts, *quite* is for 'altogether'. Its collocation is, however, neoteric.

"He left me *quite* pleased with the interest he seemed to take in my concerns." Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 21.

"I am *quite* impatient," &c. "I am *quite* proud that," &c. "I seemed *quite* lightsome to myself." "*Quite* an adept." Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 2, pp. 55, 244; Vol. 4, pp. 25, 122.

"Here, again, you are *quite* scandalized at the Bishop's paradoxical assertions concerning the nature and end of eloquence." Bishop Hurd, in *Tracts by Warburton*, &c., p. 263.

"Dr. Wharton would be *quite* happy to see you at Old Park." Gray, *Correspondence of Gray and Mason* (ed. 1855), p. 341.

"I am *quite* pleased with Your Lordship's plan." Edmund Burke, *Correspondence*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 169.

"If you bring your neighbour, the Thames, with you, it will be *quite* agreeable." *Id.*, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, *&c., Vol. 1, p. 188.*

article", it is not very long ago that such a collocation of words, to mean what it means above, was

---

"I lived near a fortnight in the house, *quite* agreeably." Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote* (ed. 1820), Vol. 1, p. 124.

"He was *quite* melancholy till he received Mrs. Sarsanet's letter." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 136.

"His spleen against the Chevalier is *quite* entertaining." Colman, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 233.

"My mother's dislike to going out makes her *quite* ingenious to find reasons to avoid rides." "She seems *quite* melancholy." Miss Wilkes, *Correspondence of the late John Wilkes*, &c. (1805), Vol. 4, pp. 289, 290.

"I gave such a monstrous scream, that it *quite* made Mr. Meadows start." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 2, Ch. 4.

"Besides, you are so good and so gentle, that it *quite* composes me to talk with you." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Book 3, Ch. 8.

"She's well enough, ... but shy, *quite* too shy." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Book 4, Ch. 2.

"I assure you you would *quite* have fallen in love with him." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Book 6, Ch. 2.

"Really, going to Mr. Harrel's again would have been *quite* too dismal." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Book 6, Ch. 10.

"I am *quite* angry with Pitt." Gibbon, *Miscellaneous Works* (ed. 1814), Vol. 1, p. 321.

"I am *quite* surprised at Johnson's diligence." "He is *quite* a gentleman, and a very sensible one." "The chamber is better, and *quite* smart." "I am *quite* oppressed by it" [this hot weather]. Cowper, *Works* (ed. Southey, 1835—1837), Vol. 4, p. 102; Vol. 5, pp. 193, 295; Vol. 6, p. 163.

"The gallery immediately before its entrance appeared *quite* gay." Beckford, *Italy*, &c. (ed. 1834), Vol. 1, p. 326.

"He was *quite* uneasy at the pleasure I felt," &c. Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., p. 167, foot-note.

"There was a mill in this vale, *quite* a comfortable dwelling." *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, Vol. 1, p. 84.

"It was *quite* a comfort to me." *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 490.

"We are *quite* astonished," &c. Sydney Smith, *Works* (one-vol. ed., London, 1850), p. 174.

"The thought . . . makes me *quite* dread the return of the Sunday." "It *quite* disturbs me to think of it." "The vale of Florence looks *quite* poor and dull," &c. Dr. Arnold, *Life and Correspondence* (ed. 1856), pp. 46, 54, 61.

unknown. There, as in some other positions, *quite* often holds, in signification, a place intermediate between 'altogether' and 'somewhat'.[1] The French *assez* and the Italian *assai* have a similar acceptation.

In the third edition of Professor Maximilian Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language*,[2] we are informed that, "in fact, '*very* pleased' and '*very* delighted' are Americanisms which may be heard even in this country". A lamentable state of things, this, no doubt; only the implied disdain of America, which would be sufficiently censurable, if hereditary, is, as being only imitative and conciliatory, still more censurable, not to say unphilosophic. The phrases just named become, however, in Professor Müller's fourth edition,[3] simply "expressions which may be

"He really looks *quite* concerned." Landor, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 447.

"Honesty, in France, puts on a demi-saison *quite* early, but soon finds it too cold for wear." "A wolf . who was *quite* charming." *Id.*, *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, pp. 15, 230.

"*Quite* a democrat." "*Quite* amusing." Lord Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays* (5th English edition, 1848), Vol. 2, p. 88; Vol. 3, p. 6.

"When it came to be bed-time, she .... was, really, *quite* sorry to go to bed, and squeezed Arthur's hand *quite* fondly." Mr. Thackeray, *Pendennis*, Chapter 63.

It is, I suspect, to the ladies that we are indebted, originally, for the uses of *quite* here exemplified.

[1] Take the third quotation given in the preceding note; and *quite*, be it observed, has not there a negative before it. Instead of "*quite* a rake", the old English expression was 'a great rake', which does not go so far as 'altogether a rake', or 'a perfect rake'. Such a *quite a* may, generally, be exchanged for *a great, much of a*, or for something less intensive than *a complete, a full, a thorough*, or the like. *Quite*, as, for instance, in Richardson's "*quite* displeased", also imports less than 'entirely', 'thoroughly', 'fully'. *Very much* may, in some cases, represent its force; in other cases, *very*.

In some of the English colonies, *too* is strangely used for 'very', 'very much', 'quite'. [2] Vol. 1, p. 39. [3] Vol. 1, p. 40.

heard in many drawing-rooms." That they should be felt to deserve promotion from, it might be, Whitechapel or the Seven Dials, to decent society, as soon as they were discovered not to bear the brand of Americanism, was, all things considered, only to be expected. They are heard, we are told, "in many drawing-rooms." And there they were heard, without question, four or five generations ago. Sir William Jones[1] wrote "*very* concerned," in 1760; and Gibbon,[2] "*very* unqualified," in 1762.

Leaving imaginary Americanisms[3], I return, for

---

[1] *Memoirs*, &c. (ed. 1806), p. 22.

[2] *Miscellaneous Works* (ed. 1814), Vol. 4, p. 113.

Miss Carter wrote, in 1778: "I thank God my mind is *very* composed." *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 4, p. 197.

Thomas Taylor wormed out something "*very* concealed," in 1794. See his translation of *Pausanias*, Vol. 3, p. 300.

"*Very* altered." Sydney Smith, *Works*, p. 639.

"A very *concealed* manner." Mr. De Quincey, *Works*, Vol. 6, Preface, p. xvi.

"They were *very* frightened." Dr. G. W. Dasent, *Popular Tales from the Norse* (ed. 1859), p. 499. I will add, that I have heard Professor Müller declare the English of Dr. Dasent to be the purest ever written.

No less discordant than *very* before any participle not thoroughly adjectivized, like *animated* or *pleasing*, is *much* before the positive degree of an adjective which has not grown out of a past participle. "*Much* beneficial" is used by Fuller. *The Historie of the Holy Warre* (ed. 1647), p. 171. Jeremy Collier has "very *much* impertinent." *A Short View*, &c. (ed. 1698), p. 167. Addison writes "very *much* conversant." *The Spectator*, No. 600. "At Westminster School I was *much* intimate with Walter Bagot." Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 185. In *The Task*, IV., 433, and V., 815, Cowper has "*much* solicitous" and "*much* conversant"; and, in his *Iliad*, I., 140, "*much* unmeet." Where, in such phrases, 'not' is prefixed, their unidiomaticalness is, here and there, somewhat mitigated.

Nor, for obvious reasons, though we say 'a *very* flowing style', do we say 'a *very* flowing stream', or, with Addison, "a *most* crying dulness," "a *very* shining light." See *The Spectator*, Nos. 61 and 63.

[3] We have had to do with Angiicisms precipitately adjudged to be

illustration of the topic under treatment, to false criticisms on words and phrases of a more general character.

"In certain new books we find *wended*. There is, pro-

Americanisms. A flagrant example of miscarriage, in trying to shift the burthen of a neoterism from America to England may here fitly be noted.

Dr. Webster's editors, after quoting, in illustration of *lengthy*, a passage credited to "Gibbon, 1763", speak of it as affording "the earliest known instance" of the word's occurrence. The passage is from one of the journals kept by the historian: these, in 1763, he kept in French; and they are printed in their original form. It is from the English translation of these journals that Dr. Webster's editors unwittingly take their quotation; and this translation, anonymous, and probably the work of a bookseller's hack, was first published in the monotome edition of Gibbon's *Miscellaneous Works*, in 1837. The passage in question will be found there at p. 78.

Mr. Samuel Bailey, in his *Discourses on Various Subjects*, p. 76, after welcoming *lengthy*, as a recent American import worth the having, goes on to remark, that "It could have sprung up nowhere but in a country addicted to protracted oratory, and is a modern instance of what forms a fascinating feature in the study of etymology, namely, the power of words to indicate the habits and customs of those who used them".

If Dr. Webster's editors had been in the right, ground would have been offered for the comment on Mr. Bailey, that, unhappily for his pretty little argument, *lengthy* had already been used in England in the time of the American colonists, who are not known to have been specially addicted to oratory, protracted or otherwise. And, after all, as the word originated, so far as is known, in the days of Washington, who uses it, one may still justly object to Mr. Bailey's associating it with American longiloquence in oratory, a feature of the present century. Moreover, can it be proved that the epithet was ever applied to spoken discourses any more freely than to written? And, since *longsome* was once employed in the sense which it bears,—for Bp. Hall tells of a "*longsome* treatise",—why suppose that the modern Americans are more tedious in exposition than their English ancestors were? Finally, that Englishmen found as much scope for the word at home as Americans found for it among themselves is evinced by the facts, that they were not slow to adopt it, and that it now meets with disfavour from none but the most finical purists. It must be admitted, however, that to give the termination *-y a disparaging* import lacks the support of analogy.

perly, no such word: Spenser has coined it unlawfully. *Went* is the preterite of *wend*, as *lent* of *lend*, *spent*[1] of *spend*, *bent* of *bend*".

Such is the opinion which Landor[2] puts into the mouth of Horne Tooke; and he feigns Bp. Parker to have said to Andrew Marvel:

"I have seen fantastical folks . . . who write *wend*, instead of *go*, and are so ignorant of grammar as even to put *wended* for *went*".[3]

The Rev. Mr. Blackley writes, to the same effect:

"'To *wend* one's way' is a perfectly correct expression; but the stilted style of novel-writing, now happily upon the wane, exhibits many instances of the inaccurate form 'he *wended* his way', caused by the writer's ignorance of the fact that *went*, which we use as the irregular preterite of the verb 'to *go*', is, in fact, the regular preterite of the verb 'to *wend*'."[4]

All this is very loose and uncritical, and even worse. It is by such lessons as these that the unreflecting and uninquiring are misled into eschew-

---

[1] Apparently, not even in Chaucer's time did people yet say *spente* or *spent*, but *spende;* and yet they said *rente*, the older form being *rende*. Accepting *spent*, and ignoring the fact that we got *mend*, through the French, from the Latin, Landor writes, in his usual arbitrary fashion: "I have observed *rent*, as preterite of *rend:* improper; as *ment* would be of *mend*." *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 109.

Since both *spend* and *mend* are traceable to the Latin, he should, in consistency, have contended for *ment*, on the model of *spent;* and *rent*, if on the analogy of *went*, ought to have been unobjectionable to him. Did he demand *rended?* Of this I have lighted on one instance. "With this, the grave venerable bishop, giving me his benediction, fetcht such a sigh that would have *rended* a rock asunder", &c. James Howell, *Twelve Several Treatises*, &c. (1661), p. 331.

[2] *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 194. [3] *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 100.

[4] *Word Gossip*, p. 111.

ing, as if they were wrong, words and phrases which are perfectly right. Who will venture to say that *went* is, to us, the preterite of *wend?* And, now that *wend* has become an independent verb, why may we not inflect it? If '*to wend* one's way' and 'He *wends* his way' are good English, equally so is "he *wended* his way".[1]

But let us dwell a little longer on the word so peremptorily dismissed as unbearable. In old English there was the present *wende* or *went*, 'go', 'turn', the preterite of which came to be—as *spende* became *spent*,—*wende*, 'went'; and the past participle, *went*, *wend*, 'gone', 'turned'. The present, modernized into *wend*, dropped out of ordinary and untechnical prose; but the preterite, *went*, has come down to us. That *wend* and *went*[2] were ever contemporaneously

---

[1] *Wend*, as a reflexive verb, occurs in James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), p. 163.

[2] Of *went*, as the participle of *wend*, 'go', I have met with one old instance. "And yt wyll be somewhat the more harde, bycause that, where as men wolde have *went* soneste to have founde them", &c. Sir Thomas More, *Apologye* (1533), fol. 255.

But it seems almost incredible that a magnate of the Church of England could write, in the last century: "Whether Mr. Wesley has not *went* to bed since that time, others may know as well as himself". Bp. Lavington, *Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared* (ed. 1833), p. 22.

At p. 119 of the same work occurs "quite *oftenly*", which is full as odd. Like *oftenly* are *halfly*, used by John Halle (1565), in *An Historiall Expostulation*, &c., p. 39 (ed. 1844), and *nextly*, found in *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings* (1594), fol. 17 v.

A mate for Bp. Lavington's *went* is afforded by Isaac Barrow.

"What men ever upon earth have been more sorely afflicted, have *underwent* greater losses, disgraces, labours, troubles, distresses in any kind, than did the H. Apostles?" *Works* (ed. 1683–1692), Vol. 1, p. 19.

"It recommendeth to us the examples of those who have *underwent* unspeakable pains", &c. *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 295.

used as equivalent to our 'go' and 'went', is more easily intimated than proved. *Went* being settled in its present signification, it was necessary, to bring out, unambiguously, the sense intended by a preterite of *wend*, to coin *wended*.[1] For the rest, Landor would, assuredly, have been nonplussed, if asked what he meant by saying that "there is, properly, no such word" as *wended*. Of the proper existence of a word his ideas must have been most peculiar. And why might not Spenser try his hand at coining a word?[2] Landor himself has ventured new coin-

[1] We have, similarly, *grafted*, from *graffed*, *graft*, formerly the preterite of *graff*; *hoisted*, from *hoised*, *hoist*, formerly the preterite of *hoise*; and *wafted*, from *waffed*, *waft*, formerly the preterite of *waff* (*i. e.*, *wave*); and we once had *snifted*, from *sniffed*, *snift*, the preterite of *sniff*. Possibly, *snort* and the old *swound* sprang from *snored* and *swooned*. With these compare the vulgar *drownded*. The old verbs *clad*—used by Puttenham, Philemon Holland, and Ed. Dacres,—and *fraught* are not from *clothe* and *freight*. The origin of the verb *girt*, from *gird*, is doubtful, as to its mode. The *d* of an infinitive may have been changed to *t*; a preterite may have become an infinitive; or a substantive may have been converted into a verb. The verb *rift*, like the verb *weight*, came from a substantive. In very modern writings I have repeatedly seen the participle *soddened*, which assumes the existence of a verb *sodden*. It should not much surprise us, if this *sodden* were to take the place, in time, of the obsolete *seethe*. Fuller has *unshakened*, in *The Appeal*, &c., Part 1, p. 49.

[2] *Wended*, we are told by Landor, as if endowed with omniscience, "Spenser has coined", &c. Let us see whether Spenser had not predecessors in the use of it.

"Thenne the squier *weyndut* upon his way,
And to the marchand conne he say;
His ernde told he thenne".
Sir Amadace, st. 20.

"These three men *wended* at their will,
This felon sow qwhyl they came tyll,
Liggand under a tree".
The Felon Sowe and the Freeres of Richmonde, st. 6.

For these two passages, see *Three Early English Metrical Romances*, &c. (1842), pp. 35, 106.

ages enough. And what would he have had Bishop Parker understand by *wend*, if not 'go'?

"It disturbs me to find, in Southey, . . the word *re-write*. I had thought it, and *reread*, the spawn infecting a muddier and shallower water. Properly, *re* should precede none but words of Latin origin,[1] though there are a few exceptions of some date and authority".

Landor is here again quoted;[2] and it is manifest that the great Latinist and patron of regicide was easily robbed of his equanimity. The "few exceptions" which he alludes to we are to discover as best we can. By an unsparing application of his tyrannical canon, we should be deprived of many a good word which we could ill dispense with, as *rebind, rebuff, rebuild, rebuke, recast, recoin, refill, refit, refresh, regard, reland, relight, remake, remould, resell, retail, review*, and *reward*, to name no more. It is curious how common it is for writers to prescribe strait-jackets to themselves and others. Landor, as we have seen, had a horror of hybridism; as if our language was not crowded with hybrids. And such a horror had William Taylor, too,—a succulent quarry for any one minded to hawk at verbal eccentricities,—as witness his *coevality, continuality, graduality, habituality, parentality, solitarity, sonorosity, virtuosity, voluntarity*. Had he been more thorough-going than he was, he ought to have insisted,—taking a handle from *decrepitude*,

[1] Landor, as I need not tell those who know his writings well, would not so designate a word derived to us from the Latin, but through the French.

[2] *Walter Savage Landor, a Biography*, Vol. 2, pp. 525, 526.

desuetude, exactitude, infinitude, and *promptitude,*—on *abjectitude, abruptitude, directitude, distinctitude, selectitude, strictitude,* and *succinctitude.*[1] If English were to be beggared and deformed throughout on principles like those by which Landor and Taylor would have controlled it, the result would be a thing at which they themselves would have sickened as heartily as their neighbours.

In the rough language of Landor,[2] "to talk about

---

[1] He should have preferred *largeity,* too, Thomas Nash's *tardity,* and, with Puttenham and Camden, *grandity.*

[2] *Walter Savage Landor, a Biography,* Vol. 2, p. 528. Landor also makes Dr. Johnson say to Horne Tooke: "Within the last year or two, I have heard the expression 'a man of *talent*', instead of 'a man of *talents*'." *Works,* Vol. 1, p. 165.

A similarly hasty criticism by Landor is here subjoined.

"*Tooke.* What an outcry would be raised against you or me, if we applied a verb in the singular to several nouns!

"*Johnson.* And justly.

"*Tooke.* Yet eloquence sometimes requires it, even in our own language. The Italian has not repudiated it." *Id.,* Vol. 1, p. 210.

Johnson would never have assented to Tooke's remark, as he is fabled to have done.

"The *querulousness and indignation* which *is* observed so often to disfigure the last scene of life, naturally *leads* us to inquiries like these." *The Rambler,* No. 50.

"Nor *has* the *roughness and brutality* of more savage countries ever provoked," &c. *The Idler,* No. 87.

"What *has disease, deformity, and filth,* upon which the thoughts can be allowed to dwell?" *Life of Swift.*

"Such *order and connexion . was* not perceived by Addison." *Life of Pope.*

"*The oak and the thorn is* equally a stranger," &c. *A Journey,* &c., Aberbrothick.

And Johnson's predecessors and successors often write in the same way.

"*Abstinence and mortification has* formerly been thought necessary for the security of virtue. Jeremy Collier, *A Short View,* &c. (ed. 1730), p. 423.

a 'man of *talent*' is to talk like a fool"; and, in the judgment of Archbishop Trench, this phrase is "nonsense."[1] These hasty verdicts are grounded,

"His *love and regard* for our Constitution *is* so remarkable," &c. Addison, *The Freeholder*, No. 46.

"*Milk and water is* his darling liquor." Cowper, *The Connoisseur*, No. 111.

"*Conversation and* fireside *society is* almost quite lost among us." Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 84.

"The *harmony and* true *modulation* of verse *depends* upon a perfect pronunciation," &c. Bishop Lowth, *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Preliminary Dissertation, p. viii.

"No repining *care*, no consuming *sorrow*, no dazzling *fear inhabits* there." *Id.*, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 271.

"What *is birth and death?*" Shelley, *Essays*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 225.

"In history, *the hero and the politician dwindles* into a vain and feeble tyrant." Lord Macaulay, *Miscellaneous Writings* (ed. 1860), Vol. 2, p. 89.

"They point to the flying dust, the falling bricks, the comfortless rooms, the frightful irregularity of the whole appearance, and then ask, in scorn, where the promised *splendour and comfort is* to be found." *Id.*, *Essay on Milton*.

Similar passages might be quoted from our older writers, by the myriad. Nay, where the verb came first, it was the rule to put it in the singular. "Heere *is* met *courage and constancy*." Feltham, *Resolves*, &c. (ed. 1628), First Centurie, p. 13. So wrote hundreds, before and after Feltham. And who, even now, would not write, with Lord Macaulay, "Everywhere else *was the thunder, and the fire* running along the ground," &c.? *Speeches* (ed. 1854), p. 507.

Landor, I am convinced, was neither an extensive nor a careful reader of our literature. Sometimes, indeed, his verbal criticisms are worth weighing; but, in large part, they are founded on mere whim. For instance, he could not bear the verb *impugn*. Southey—*Selections from the Letters*, &c., Vol. 4, p. 283,—after showing, from Johnson's *Dictionary*, how thoroughly respectable it is, adds: "We have the word, not from the French, but from the Normans, who, by the change which they produced in our language, overpaid this country for all the evils which they brought upon it by the Conquest. A word of Norman extraction must not be expelled under the Alien Act."

The absurdest, perhaps, of all Landor's philological speculations is the following, fictitiously assigned to Horne Tooke: "*While* is 'the *time* when'; *whiles*, 'the *times* when'." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 156.

[1] *On the Study of Words* (ed. 1859), p. 66. In another work I

evidently, on the assumption,—contestable, at best,—that our familiar employment of *talent* is historic-

have cited Archbishop Trench's estimate of Mr. De Quincey, as "the greatest living master of our English tongue." Mr. De Quincey, in his *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 168, and elsewhere, uses, however, the expression "man of *talent*." The Archbishop, therefore, if he knows what he is saying, allows that a man may be a supereminent authority for English, and yet may write "nonsense".

If the Archbishop's denunciation be just, *talent*, whatever its context, must, when put for 'mental endowments', be "nonsense". As to its age and good repute, in this sense, he is entirely in the dark.

"So silly a fellow, of no *talent* nor praiseworthie part in him in the world." "Silly bodies and sorie fellowes of no *talent*, gift, or ability." William Watson, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions* (1602), pp. 14, 336.

"Other poore rogues of lesse *talent*." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 193.

"And I cannot wonder enough, that none, all this while, ... have not employed their *talent* to this taske," &c. Howell, *Dodona's Grove* (1640), p. 167.

"He got the reputation of a person of no ordinary *talent*." Translation of *Il Cardinalismo di Santa Chiesa* (1670), p. 188.

Here *talent* is to render *talento;* but, at pp. 163, 184, 310, where the English has the singular,—"his *talent*," &c.,—the original has *talenti*, the plural.

"If I had your *talent* or power to make my actions speak for me," &c. Steele, *The Conscious Lovers*, Act 3.

"Your *talent* may be universal: I believe it is." Lady Bradshaigh (1749), in the *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, Vol. 4, p. 259.

"There are those who will never suffer such *talent* as yours to be long hid under a bushel." Mrs. Susannah Maria Cibber (1765), in the *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 201.

"Nay, a good author possesses a versatility of *talent*," &c. Colman (1775), *The Gentleman*, No. 6.

Coleridge, in 1809, speaks of *talent* as being "a gift so unequally dispensed by nature", &c., and uses the expression "the aristocracy of *talent*." *Essays on His Own Times*, p. 655.

He also writes: "Shakespeare is the height, breadth, and depth of genius; Beaumont and Fletcher, the excellent mechanism, in juxtaposition and succession, of *talent*." *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 317. Also see Vol. 1, p. 192; Vol. 2, p. 306.

See, further, on *genius* and *talent*, Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, Ch. 2.

ally connected with the *talents* of the parable.[1] Though we fully acceded to that assumption, still, as

---

"So many youths of distinguished *talent*," &c. Southey, *Cowper's Works*, Vol. 2, p. 71.

"All the real *talent* and resolution in England." Mr. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, p. 189.

In 1773, Horace Walpole used the phrase "this mine of *talent*", which was declared to be "obsolete". See *Gray's Works* (ed. Mitford, 1858), Vol. 4, p. 218.

Other quotations, old and new, for *talent* are given in notes following.

[1] For some considerable time, *talento*, &c.—though "a suo *talento*" still means 'at his *pleasure*',—have been used, by the Italians, French, and others, just as we now use *talent*. Once these words were absurdly derived, as by Ménage and etymologists of his school, from θέλειν, "à quoi répugne la forme du mot", to quote the obvious criticism of M. Littré. *Histoire de la Langue Française* (ed. 1863), Vol. 1, p. 7. Even so late a lexicographer as M. Raynouard derives *talent* after this exploded fashion. *Lexique Roman* (1836—44), Vol. 5, p. 296. In the same work, Vol. 3, p. 41, the Romance *dia*, 'day', is, also, wildly deduced from the Greek. Quoting from Macrobius the words "Cretenses Δία τὴν ἡμέραν vocant", M. Raynouard takes Δία to be a feminine nominative, not an accusative masculine. Though grammar tolerated a nominative Δία in the clause just quoted, and though the word were a feminine, still it would be more prudent to suppose *dia* to be corrupted from *dies*, than, in quest of its source, to leap over the Latin to the Greek. M. Raynouard would have done wisely, if, as regarded accounting for *talent* and *dia*, he had adhered to his own very sensible principle, laid down in Vol. 1, p. xxvii.: "Je n'ai eu recours au grec, pour expliquer l'origine d'un mot, qu'à défaut de toute autre langue moins ancienne d'où je ne pouvais le faire dériver, par la raison qu'en fait d'étymologie, c'est généralement la plus proche qui aide le mieux à faire connaître le sens primitif des mots."

Ducange quotes, from the will of Stephania, Queen of Navarre, the following passage, written in 1098: "Igitur si venerit ad aliquam de meas filias in *talentum* Deo servire", &c. Here *talentum* means 'desire'. I do not find that the patristic writers used either τάλαντον or *talentum* metaphorically.

Talent signifies, in Chaucer's translation of Boethius, &c., and in Gower, Udall, Chapman, &c. &c., 'will', 'inclination', 'affection', '*appetite*', 'earnest humour', 'passion'.

Some twenty or thirty medieval derivatives of *talentum* might here

soon as *talents* came to import 'mental faculties, endowments, or qualifications', there was no violence

---

be specified. To keep to English, *talentif*, for 'desirous', occurs in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* (ed. 1864), l. 350. And Chaucer uses the verb *entalenten*, for 'excite'. Even in Sir Walter Scott's novels, we find *maltalent*,—once, 'displeasure', 'anger',—for 'evil inclination', with *talent*, for 'inclination', 'purpose'.

M. Roquefort, after stating the value of the Attic *talent*, says: "Le mot *talent* fut ensuite appliqué aux trésors du génie, aux connoissances, aux heureuses dispositions pour une science ou un art." *Dictionnaire Étymologique*, &c. (1829), Vol. 2, p. 428.

The old metaphorical meanings assigned, by M. Raynouard, to *talent* are "envie, désir, volonté, goût, penchant, disposition". *Lexique Roman*, Vol. 5, p. 296.

Still later, M. Burguy has: "*Talent, talant, telant* . . . *talent* (monnaie)—désir, envie, volonté, goût, inclination de l'esprit, propension, disposition, resolution; de *talentum*, *τάλαντον*, balance, d'où poids, trait, traction, attraction. . . . . La signification aptitude, habilité, qu'on attribua plus tard à *talent*, se rapporte à la signification primitive, somme, trésor, qu'on a sur soi." *Grammaire de la Langue d'Oïl*, Vol. 3, pp. 358, 359.

"*Talent* . . . proprement trésor, richesse, puis, don de la nature, génie." M. Brachet, *Dictionnaire Étymologique*, &c., p. 519.

As to several of the links in most of these evolutional chains, however, no attempt is made to show that they ever existed; and, until their existence shall be proved historically, the etymologists who devised them are to be commended as ingenious, rather than as scientific.

The third signification which Dr. Johnson gives of *talent* is 'quality, disposition', which he calls "an improper and mistaken use". Lord Clarendon and Swift are quoted for it. But why were these uses—I put the plural; for they are not to be identified,—"improper and mistaken"? They were once very common; and *talent* had, sometimes, the meanings 'characteristic', 'specialty', 'habit', &c., also. For these several senses I subjoin extracts.

"To prove how they would use their *talent* of natural light", &c. Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 195.

"To every one some *talent* is committed, which, in subordination to God's service, he may improve", &c. *Id., ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 214.

"Aye, but that sort of knowledge is not a wife's *talent*." Vanbrugh, *The Provoked Wife*, Act 1, Scene 1.

"Besides, 't is my particular *talent* to ridicule folks." *Id., ibid.*, Act 2, Scene 2.

in speaking of a single such faculty, endowment, or qualification, as *a talent*, or in the subsequent step,

---

"Lord Rake and Lord Foplington give you their *talent* in their title." Jeremy Collier, *A Short View*, &c. (ed. 1730), p. 113.

"Railing is a mean and unchristian *talent*." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 197.

I omit some twenty more like instances in Collier.

"It 's true, J. T. calls this an unpardonable simile; but when, then, would he revive it? It must certainly be for no other reason but that he has a mind, as far as his *talent* will reach, to make clergymen of all orders and denominations ridiculous." *Remarks on the 'Life of Mr. Milton'*, &c. (1699), p. 11.

"The most necessary *talent*, therefore, in a man of conversation, which is what we ordinarily intend by a fine gentleman, is a good judgment." Steele, *The Guardian*, No. 21.

"If wit is to be measured by the circumstances of time and place, there is no man has, generally, so little of that *talent* as he who is a wit by profession." *Id.*, *ibid.*, No. 29.

"I shall here add, that I know nothing so effectual to raise a man's fortune as complaisance, which recommends more to the favour of the great than wit, knowledge, or any other *talent* whatsoever." Addison, *The Guardian*, No. 162.

"He enjoyed, in the highest perfection, two *talents* which do not often meet in the same person,—the greatest strength of good sense, and the most exquisite taste of politeness." *Id.*, *The Freeholder*, No. 39.

"Mr. Wesley owns his *talent* of ejecting Satan." Bishop Lavington, *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared* (ed. 1833), p. 203.

"Pride is not my *talent*." Richardson, *Pamela* (ed. 1811), Vol. 1, p. 118.

"Thou hast no *talent* but ill-nature." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 343.

"The man's *talent* is not taciturnity." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 261.

"Mr. Pope's bodily disadvantages must incline him to a more laborious cultivation of his *talent*, without which he foresaw that he must have languished in obscurity." Shenstone, *Works* (ed. 1764), Vol. 2, p. 177.

"Yet what shall we say for those churlish malecontents who pretend to write satire, with no other earthly *talent* for it than rank malevolence?" Anon., *The World*, No. 191.

Sterne says, regarding "the malignity and the festivity of wit": "The one is a mere quickness of apprehension, void of humanity, and is a *talent* of the Devil; the other", &c. Sermon 18.

transforming the concrete into the abstract, and giving us *talent*. This was, however, only part of

---

"Why, you can't, sir, be a stranger to his prodigious skill in the traveller's *talent?*" Foote, *The Liar*, Act 2, Scene 1.

"I am the more solicitous about it, because it relates to the only taste we can call our own; the only proof of our original *talent* in matter of pleasure,—I mean, our skill in gardening." Gray, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 21.

"You are a lawyer, sir, and know better than I do, upon what particular occasions a *talent* for misrepresentation may be fairly exerted." *Letters of Junius*, No. 18.

"The *talent* of haranguing in private company is insupportable." Bishop Horne, *Olla Podrida*, No. 7.

"The Latin translation is so confused, that I should have wondered if Martin, whose *talent* for the languages was none of the happiest, had understood it." Porson, *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis*, p. 220.

"In his attacks on Salmasius, and others more obscure, he appears to have mistaken his *talent*, in supposing he was witty." Landor, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 173.

Some old exemplifications of the use of *talent* shall now be brought forward.

"And, all thoughe I do neither dyspute nor expounde holy scripture, yet, in suche workes as I have and intende to sette forth, my pore *talent* shall be, God willing, in suche wyse bestowed, that no mannes conscience shalbe therwith offended." Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Image of Governance* (ed. 1544), Preface, sig. a iii r.

"The poore *talent* of learnyng whiche god hath lent me." Ascham, *Toxophilus* (1545), p. 140 (ed. 1868).

"That poore *talente* whyche GOD hath endued them wyth." Raphe Robynson, Translation of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1551), p. 15 (ed. 1869).

"Set your *talents* a worke." Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579), p. 52 (ed. 1868).

"I hartily thanke the author himselfe for using his pleasaunte and witty *talente* with so much discretion, and with so little harme," &c. Anon. (1580), in *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2 (1815), p. 258.

"If, in the knowledge of nature, thou hast learned, by songs, to praise God, his justice, and heavenly providence, or, in moral knowledge, to commende the law, humane societe, the government of the common-wealth, and therein to respect honor, not profit, hide not this *talent*, but teach it others, and give thy selfe an example, unto them, of well doing, and of profiting every one." *The French Academie*, Part 1 (ed. 1589), pp. 352, 353.

the process to which we owe *talent*, as now employed. Formerly, the word denoted 'specific or distinctive

"But I shall tell thee, according to my *talent*, and as the poorenesse of my understanding shall give me leave." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 123.

"Nature having bestowed on you a *talent* larger than that of any other woman," &c. James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), p. 15.

"On her, therefore, spent he all the *talent* of his hatred." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 66.

"Their learning, you say, consists only in some superficial *talent* of preaching," &c. Chillingworth, *Works* (ed. 1742), p. 17.

A few references are subjoined for those who wish to go more thoroughly into the subject here considered. Bishop Sanderson, *Twelve Sermons*, &c. (1637), p. 108. Gataker, in *Abel Redevivus* (1651), p. 525. Lord Preston, Translation of *Boethius* (1695), p. 235. Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees* (ed. 1724), p. 48. Coleridge, *Essays on His Own Times*, pp. 181, 187, 189, 238, 240, 458, 469, 736: *Church and State*, &c. (ed. 1839), p. 402. Charles Lamb, *Prose Works* (ed. 1838), Vol. 2, p. 162. Wordsworth, *Poetical Works* (ed. 1846), Vol. 3, p. 324.

It will have been observed, from the extracts given near the beginning of this note, that the French etymologists do not suppose their *talent*, as now used, to be deduced from the parable of the *talents*; nor have I discovered that the sense of 'ability' given to *talento* is considered, by the Italians, to have such a history. That our constant reminders of the parable have helped largely to popularize our *talent*, for 'ability', is, I think, all that can be asserted confidently. The medieval modifications of *talentum*—and even *talentum* itself—meant 'desire', 'inclination', &c., between which and the sense of their classical original there is no perceptible connexion. The link between these senses, assuming that there was one, is lost. My contention is, that, in like manner, there probably was a nexus of denotation,—and very likely it was not an elliptical metaphor,—intermediate to 'desire' and 'ability', as senses of *talento*, &c. Our present sense of *talent* does not appear, I believe, in our literature, before the days when our language was undergoing copious enrichment, by reason of translations made into it from the Italian, and by reason of the familiarity of our ancestors with French. In these languages, respectively, *talento* and *talent* already signified 'ability'; and in these languages, whence we seem to have derived this signification of *talent*, our developmental investigations, touching the point in question, are, if to any fruitful *result, to be prosecuted.*

mental endowments,' and was intensified, as it now is, by being made plural; and then, from being definite, it became indefinite, and acquired the acceptation of 'general mental endowments.' 'A man of *talents*' would satisfy both Landor and Archbishop Trench; and 'a man of *talent*' would, likewise, satisfy almost anybody else, as Burke,[1] Godwin,[2] William Taylor,[3] Hazlitt,[4] Charles Lamb,[5] Mr. De Quincey,[6] Lord Macaulay,[7] and Dr. Newman,[8] for instance. The objection felt to the phrase 'man of *talent*' seems to rest on the notion, that the metaphor implied in it amounts to an intolerable catachresis. A person influenced by this notion must, indeed, draw nice distinctions, not to find 'man of *talents*', also, figurative beyond endurance. At any rate, though he might put up with 'a man of *genuine talents*', or with 'a man of *sterling talents*', he ought, consistently, to reject such locutions as 'a man of *versatile*, or of *transcendent, talents*', and '*talents of a high order*'; since nummulary *talents*, however qualifiable, are not

---

[1] "Men of *talent*" occurs in *A Letter to William Elliot, Esq.*, 1795.

[2] For "man of *talent*", see *The Enquirer* (1797), pp. 10, 31; for "men of *talent*", pp. 307, 354; for "persons of *talent*", p. 51.

[3] "A gentleman of *talent*". *The Annual Review*, Vol. 6 (1808), p. 269.

[4] *Characteristics* (ed. 1837), p. 134.

[5] *The Letters of Charles Lamb* (ed. 1837), Vol. 2, p. 34.

[6] *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 18; Vol. 15, p. 150; &c. &c. But see, particularly, Mr. De Quincey's elaborate contrast between *genius* and *talent*, in Vol. 5, pp. 275, 276.

[7] *Miscellaneous Writings* (London ed. of 1860), Vol. 2, p. 193. Elsewhere he has "industry and *talent*", "rising *talent*", "sufficient *talent*", "a greater display of *talent*", "more *talent*", &c.

[8] *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, p. 277: *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects*, pp. 22, 109, 192, 341: *Essays Critical and Historical* Vol. 1, pp. 133, 153, 270; Vol. 2, p. 379.

to be qualified as either *versatile*, or *transcendent*, or of any *order*, high or low.[1] Here, once more, we have professed critics of English marking with reprobation a mode of speech which, while legitimated by the most obvious analogy, contemporary usage universally sanctions.

Coleridge, borrowing, consciously or unconsciously, from Dr. Johnson,[2] is reported to have said:

"I regret to see that vile and barbarous vocable *talented* stealing out of the newspapers into the leading reviews and most respectable publications of the day. Why not *shillinged*, *farthinged*, *tenpenced*, &c.? The formation of a participle passive from a noun is a licence that nothing but a very peculiar felicity can excuse. If mere convenience is to justify such attempts upon the idiom, you cannot stop till the language becomes, in the proper sense of the word, corrupt. Most of these pieces of slang come from America."[3]

---

[1] "Those whisperers who, not having sufficient parts to *publish* their own *talents*", &c. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (ed. 1656), p. 199.

"*Noble talents* in several sciences." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 244.

"I mean to be vastly civil to female *talent of all sorts*." R. B. Sheridan, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 348.

On the principles spoken of in the text, these locutions are inadmissible.

Also see the foot of p. 67, *supra*, where, in the passage from *The French Academie*, one is exhorted to *teach* a *talent*.

[2] "There has, of late, arisen a practice of giving to adjectives derived from substantives the termination of participles; such as 'the *cultured* plain', 'the *daisied* bank': but I am sorry to see, in the lines of a scholar like Gray, 'the *honeyed* spring'." *Life of Gray*.

Mr. Mitford, in the preface to his edition of Gray's *Works*, quotes an admirable reply to this, from Lord Grenville's unpublished *Nugæ Metricæ*. We are there reminded that *honeyed* has the sanction of both Shakespeare and Milton, and that the analogous *mellitus* is found *in Catullus, Cicero*, and Horace. [3] *Table-talk* (ed. 1836), p. 171.

Commenting, at an earlier date, on Southey's expression, "the mother's *anguished* shriek", he remarks, to the same effect, as regards grammatical principle:

"Not English. A participle presupposes a verb. Now, there is no such verb as 'to *anguish*'; ergo, there can be no such participle as *anguished*. To guard with jealous care the purity of his native tongue, the sublime Dante declares to be the first duty of a poet. It is this conviction, more than any other, which actuates my severity to-

---

Towards America and Americans Coleridge's dispositions were not of the most amicable.

In the second of *Satyrane's Letters*, which form part of the *Biographia Literaria*, he informs his readers, that "the proper antipode of a gentleman is to be sought among the Anglo-American democrats."

Elsewhere he says: "Speaking of America, it is, I believe, a fact, verified beyond doubt, that, some years ago, it was impossible to obtain a copy of *The Newgate Calendar*, as they had all been bought up by the Americans,—whether to suppress this blazon of their forefathers, or to assist in their genealogical researches, I could never learn satisfactorily." *Letters, Conversations, and Recollections of S. T. Coleridge* (1836), Vol. 2, p. 139.

Landor's estimate of Coleridge is: "Never was love more imaginary than his love of truth. Not only did he never embrace her, never bow down to her and worship her, but he never looked her earnestly in the face." *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 335.

Day by day, the opinion is gaining ground, not only that Coleridge, with all his ability, was the essence of conceit, but that he had few real convictions on any subject. I know of no person, in the annals of literature, that seems to have juggled more egregiously with his conscience, and that has thrown more dust into the eyes of right reason. Talk and write he must; and, not to break outright with Christian society, there was nothing left for him but to spend his ingenuity in elaborating equivocal quirks and mysterious subtilties. Church-of Englandmen who think at all, whether high or broad, are alike profoundly indebted to him. Anglican platitudinarians agree, as to him, with most of the remainder of the world. But just so Sir Isaac Newton's cook and Sir Isaac himself were at unity concerning Ptolemy's eccentrics and epicycles.

wards Southey, W. Scott, etc.,—all miserable offenders."[1]

First, Coleridge condemned, absolutely, a certain category of words in *-ed;* and, afterwards, he discriminated such words æsthetically, into the tolerable

---

[1] *Odds and Ends*, No. 19 (1867), p. 19.

Mr. Samuel Bailey precipitately asserts, with reference to *talented:* "For this anomalous and objectionable epithet there is no precedent, except, perhaps, *gifted;* but the latter is, at all events, allied to the verb *give*, while the former has nothing to appeal to but a noun." *Discourses on Various Subjects*, p. 76, foot-note.

This defence, besides not being needed, is not to the point. We have had a verb *gift;* and,—for all Dr. Richardson's unhistoric assertion to the contrary,—as it did not grow out of the past participle of *give*, it must have grown out of a substantive. *Vide supra*, p. 59, note 1.

To the quotations which the dictionaries have for the verb *gift*, I add the following:

"No: men that are *gifted* for it . . . seek either to keep themselves out of the Commission, or to get themselves off again, being on." Bishop Sanderson, *Sermons* (ed. 1681), Vol. 2, pp. 261, 262. A similar instance occurs in the Bishop's *Twelve Sermons* (ed. 1637), p. 96.

Also see Matthew Lawrence, *The Use and Practice of Faith* (1657), p. 619; Milton, *Prose Works* (Bohn's ed.), Vol. 5, p. 272.

Touching *talented*, as it was formerly objected to, so some object to it even in our own day.

"Mr. Bulwer is not yet *talented*,—a pseudo-participle which no one will use who is not ripe for any atrocity;—but he *progresses* at a fearful rate." *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 65 (1837), p. 77.

Dr. Richardson, in his *Dictionary*, makes the inept observation on *talented*, that "it has been too hastily used in common speech." On what conditions, pray, would it not have been used-"too hastily"?

"Mr. Thornbury, to use a vile word of his own, is, no doubt, a *talented* writer; but he is, frequently, careless." *The Pall Mall Budget*, July 8, 1870, p. 28.

Talent has not, to my knowledge, been produced as a verb; but *outtalent*, which is just as bold a venture, has been used as such.

"But now, outargued, *outtalented*, and pushed so vehemently to leave one of whom I had no pretence to hold, if she would go," &c. Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe* (ed. 1811), Vol. 3, p. 84.

In *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1811), Vol. 7, p. 6, Richardson uses *untalented*.

and the intolerable. *Anguished*,[1] at one time, was past his bearing; yet, by and by, he used it, having discovered therein "a very peculiar felicity." To himself he thus allowed a change of taste, and a change in the direction of liberality. Of this, however, he sometimes claimed a monopoly; and, though with his alteration of view regarding *anguished* to appeal to as a precedent, any one that came to think favourably of *talented* was, nevertheless, guilty of "slang."

I have said that he uses *anguished*. In his poem called *The Sigh*, we read of "an *anguished* sigh"; and, in his *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*,[2] is the verse:

"On thy cold forehead starts the *anguished* dew."

While *talenting* and similar words have no existence, there is a very obvious reason why words of the class of *talented* are numerous; namely, that we oftener have occasion to express, through a verb, the ideas of 'possessed of a quality or attribute', 'endowedness', &c., than we have to express, through the same part of speech, the ideas of 'communicating a quality or attribute', 'endowing', &c., among which ideas are those denoted by the theoretic foundations of the actual *talented* and the potential *talenting*, and their congeners.[3] If it were a common

[1] Coleridge declares that "there is no such verb as 'to *anguish*'." Archdeacon Todd has pointed out that this verb is used by Wicliffe; and he and Dr. Richardson show that it occurs again and again in our older literature. If I were minded to spend an hour or two in turning over my notes, I might supplement their quotations for it by half a dozen more: but non est tanti.

[2] There, too, he has "the *cottaged* dell"; in *Domestic Peace*, "a *cottaged* vale"; in *Lines in the Manner of Spenser*, "a *lilied* bank"; in *Ode to the Departing Year*, "*ramparted* with rocks"; &c. &c.

[3] Not, however, that the verb neuter *talent* is by any means unsup-

operation to *coronet* a nobleman, or to *laurel* a poet, we should, probably, have, to match our *coroneted* and *laurelled*, the verbs *coronet* and *laurel*,[1] with the participles *coroneting* and *laurelling*. The verb *talent*, in like manner, we might mint legitimately, if we wanted it. The way in which *talented* and many of its fellows were once frequently used shows that these words, to the consciousness of our ancestors, began with being strictly participles.[2] At present, they have the function of participial adjectives; and, what between their distinctive termination and their history, they are, therefore, to be considered, on scientific principles, as developments from ideal verbs.[3] The analogy on which they are formed is,

---

posable. Such verbs, from substantives, we have in great abundance; as *cloud*, *fire*, *garden*, *knot*, *league*, *lecture*, &c. &c. &c.

[1] *Becoronet* and *belaurel*, and not necessarily implying intensiveness, would be just as analogical. We have dealt differently with *height* and *strength*, in forming *heighten* and *strengthen*. But thousands of substantives we convert into verbs, without the aid of prefix or suffix.

[2] The following passage from Abp. Abbot, of the time of James I., is quoted by Archdeacon Todd: "What a miserable and restless thing ambition is, when one *talented* but as a common person," &c.

Archdeacon Todd also quotes from Bishop Hall: "thy hand *sceptred* with a reed."

"I marvell your noblemen of England doe not desire to be better *languaged* in the forraine languages." Puttenham, p. 227.

"Those that are throughly *arted* in navigation." Feltham, *Resolves*, &c. (ed. 1628), Second Centurie, p. 33.

Compare Cowper's "*maned* with wavy gold." *Iliad*, 8, 47.

[3] Coleridge himself considers *talented* to be "a participle passive"; but, on his premises, he is very absurd in so considering it. "A participle presupposes a verb", he tells us; but he does not admit the assumption of a verb *talent*. How can "a participle passive" originate from a substantive, unless the substantive is transformed into a verb, to serve as intermedium?

Dean Alford is as inconsistent as Coleridge.

"*Talented* is about as bad as possible. What is it? It looks like

further, so well established, that, whatever Coleridge dogmatized, in his haste, "mere convenience"[1] is

---

a participle. From what verb? Fancy such a verb as '*to talent*'!" *A Plea for the Queen's English* (ed. 1864), p. 109.

"As we know in the case of *talented* and *moneyed*, the participle may be tolerated long before the verb is invented." *Ibid.*, p. 116.

On the first inspection, *talented*, to the Dean, only "looks like a participle"; but, by the time he has written seven pages, its mere resemblance becomes a reality. Moreover, the verb *talent*, just before exclaimed at, is now contemplated as among possibilities. Was this from a sudden fecundity of "fancy"?

[1] What other plea did our old writers consult, when they devised *principled*, which, with the verb *principle*, they were so fond of? See, besides the quotations of the lexicographers, Fuller and others, in *Abel Redevivus*, pp. 130, 144, 364, 437: Burthogge, *Causa Dei* (1675), p. 244: Puller, *The Moderation*, &c. (ed. 1843), p. 279.

We have, also, the verbs active *advantage*, *apprentice*, *evidence*, *ground*, *instance*, *privilege*, *remedy*, *reverence*, &c. &c. &c.

Dr. Priestley, differing widely, in opinion, from Dr. Johnson and Coleridge, writes: "Some nouns are elegantly converted into verbs, without any change at all. *Cushioned*, *diademed*, *ribboned*." *The Rudiments of English Grammar*, &c. (ed. 1826), p. 30.

Some conception of the freedom with which words like *talented* used to be extemporized may be formed from the ensuing extracts and references.

"The idolatour, the tyraunt, and the whoremonger are no mete mynisters for hym, though they be never so gorgyously *mytered*, *coped*, and *typpeted*, or never so fynely *forced*, *pylyoned*, and *scarletted*." Bishop Bale, *The Vocacyon*, &c. (1553), in *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 442.

"Money is a generall man, and, without doubt, excellently *parted*." Feltham, *Resolves*, &c. Second Centurie, p. 106. "A *ladied* hand." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 20.

"Whether there be any kind of magick simply so naturall, or laudably so *arted*, as may serve to abstract it from the maleficall and diabolicall?" Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, p. 166. Also see pp. 5, 69, 177, 192.

"The most indifferent and *intelligenc'd* men." Howell, *Twelve Several Treatises*, &c. (1661), p. 266.

Behavioured. Puttenham, p. 120. *Scienced*. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements*, &c., p. 53.

Then there are *booted* and *spurred*, *kilted* and *tartaned*, *bearded*, *buskined*, *cankered*, *carbuncled*, *cloistered*, *doddered*, *horned*, *ivied*, *landed*, *leisured*, *lettered*, *liveried*, *orphaned*, propertied, sharded, sleeved,

quite ground enough to justify us in coining terms on the same model, whenever they may really be required.

"Oh for an Act of Parliament," ejaculates Coleridge,[1] "for the transportation to America, or Van Dæmon's Land, of the vile, infelicissimous *felicitously!*" On the part of Coleridge, of all men, it could, certainly, have demanded very little reflection to bethink himself of cases in which *felicitously* conveys one's meaning better than *happily;* the two words not being, by any means, synonymous, in the strict sense of the term. Furthermore, if the red rag of America had not presented itself to the poet's imagination, in company with the unctuous adverb which he spurns so contemptuously, it is scarcely to be doubted that he would have dismissed it with some punishment less severe than outright proscription, and banishment beyond sea. Every reader must remember that, in *Christabel*, an owlet, weirdly prescient of a providential mastiff-*bitch* hard by, instead of comporting itself like ordinary owlets, delivers itself of a hideous *scritch*.[2] If this novel procedure of Minerva's favourite were at all better calculated than an ordinary regulation *screech* to pierce or infrigidate one's marrow, it might be connived at. But, to most tastes, it may be suspected, a lazily in-

slippered, spectacled, venomed, weaponed, wheeled, whiskered, widowed, winged, &c. &c. *Bigoted, crabbed,* and a few other anomalies, need not detain me.

Add countless words like *impassioned* and *unexampled,* with compounds like *high-lineaged* and *low-vanitied,* almost beyond count. Compounds, however, have their own special laws.

[1] *Notes, Theological,* &c. (ed. 1853), p. 225, foot-note.

[2] I am well aware that *scritch* and *scritch-owl* are found in old *authors.*

trusive *scritch* must give deeper offence than even an infelicitously[1] bestowed *felicitously;* and so, in all likelihood, must the demeanour of Coleridge's sun, which, as represented in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, *uprist*, under the despotic spell of a coming *mist*.

According to Mr. G. P. Marsh,[2] 'different *to*' is to be reckoned among "gross departures from idiomatic propriety". It is "common in England",[3] he adds;

---

[1] This word Coleridge uses in his *Church and State*, &c. (ed. 1839), p. 192.

[2] *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 669.

[3] Dean Alford takes 'different *to*' in hand; and his information and argumentation about it are at his usual level. He "was not aware," till some one pointed out to him, that it "has become very common, of late". And then: "Of course, such a combination is entirely against all reason and analogy."

A no less speaking evidence of the Dean's incompetency to discourse on the English language is seen where he says: "A correspondent complains of the use, by some of our best writers, of the subjunctive 'thou *wert*', as equivalent to the indicative 'thou *wast*'. I own I had not observed it. Of course, there can be no doubt that it is wrong, wherever it may occur."

Thirty years ago, I began to make a list of writers who have used 'thou *wert*' for 'thou *wast*'. It grew to include a hundred and forty names, the earliest of which are Elizabethan; and then I gave over. Dr. Johnson, in his *Grammar*, simply says that *wert* "ought not to be used in the indicative",—a rule which he himself violates in his Prayer dated March 28, 1754. Bishop Lowth points out the substitution of *wert* for *wast;* but he had, apparently, little idea how many suffrages for it could be mustered. It was actuated, we may safely conjecture, by an instinct against cacophony; and so well is it established, that, at least in poetry, it is free from all reproach.

Of *wert*, for *wast*, the Rev. Mr. Blackley says: "We find it everywhere, in novels and in newspapers, in poetry and in prose; and it certainly betrays one of the results of modern neglect of grammar. The greatest writers are not free from the error, who would, yet, feel indignant enough, if supposed not to know the difference between the indicative and subjunctive moods.

"Men are apt—at least, those who have not studied the subject,—to take for granted, that our earlier literature is uncouth and clumsy, and that its forms are a mere fortuitous medley, without rule or strict in-

and he might have added 'exceedingly common'. In truth, one seldom hears there, except in sermons

---

flexion; but yet our earlier literature shows no confusion between the words *wast* and *wert*, such as the present age displays: the Bible has the word *wert* only twice, both times in a subjunctive sense, always using *wast* in the indicative. And yet modern writers, who would flush into a perspiration, many a time, at the thought of having made such an error in a Latin quotation, do not hesitate to publish its equivalent in English, time after time. It is useless to excuse this, as sanctioned by usage, unless we should say that those who know best the grammar of their native tongue are bound to adopt and follow the errors which originate in the ignorance of those who truly know nothing on the subject. A man may be a good poet and a bad grammarian; and, to say that 'thou *wert* there,' instead of 'thou *wast* there,' is to be right, because Tennyson, or any one else, has written it, would compel us henceforth to adopt such a monstrous verb as 'to *wist*' into our language, because it has been used in a very beautiful poem which lately appeared in one of our Magazines." *Word Gossip*, pp. 102, 103.

Here we have not only the full measure of Dean Alford's darkness in history, but a distinct enouncement of the futile notion of grammar which I have combated so earnestly in my *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*.

But, first, how does Mr. Blackley know that the substitution which he arraigns originated in "ignorance"? Surely, except when a people is unmistakably in a state of decay, the speech of the literate is little likely to be really corrupted, however it may be altered, by the influence of the illiterate. Much rather, I should say, the grammar of the illiterate is likely to be improved by the influence of the literate. It is not, however, a depravation that is now before us; and to father the indicative *wert* on "ignorance" is wholly gratuitous. Was it from "ignorance" that *wast* displaced the old *were*, of which I shall soon speak?

As to true grammar, what is false, touching its genesis and character? If Mr. Blackley's criticism be correct, true grammar can be nothing else than a sort of final revelation. To us, it is an inheritance from happier times; and we have no more right to alter it, than we have to write a newer than the New Testament. Any alteration of it, though ever so slight, must be a sophistication.

Among "those who know best the grammar of their native tongue", Mr. Blackley is scarcely to be reckoned; seeing that he accounts the use of *wert*, as an indicative, to be unknown in "our earlier literature", and to "betray one of the results of modern neglect of grammar." The *indicative wert*,—not to adduce, needlessly for any scholar, the authority

and lectures, 'different *from*'; and, in literature, 'different *to*' has, for nearly three centuries, and

---

of Shakespeare for it,—I find to be of frequent occurrence in Shakespeare's contemporaries. I name a few of those who employ it. The Earl of Oxford, quoted in *The Arte of English Poesie*, p. 172. John Lyly, *Euphues* (1579-80), pp. 182, 386 (ed. 1868). Barnabe Riche, *Farewell*, &c. (1581), p. 188 (ed. 1846). Robert Greene, *Arcadia* (1587), p. 40 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 1): *Philomela*, p. 12 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 1). Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), p. 158 (ed. 1811). Gabriell Harvey, *Four Letters*, &c. (1592), p. 28 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 2). Thomas Nash, *Pierce Penilesse*, &c. (1592), pp. 40, 43, &c. (ed. 1842); *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem* (1594), pp. 23, 25 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 1). *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings* (1594), fol. 25 r. Robert Southwell (before 1595), *Poetical Works* (ed. 1856), p. 15. Henry Constable, in the first of four sonnets prefixed to Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1595). Henry Porter, *The Pleasant Historie*, &c. (1599), p. 80 (ed. 1841). Richard Johnson, *The Pleasant Conceites of Old Hobson*, &c. (1607), p. 32 (ed. 1844). Thomas Dekker, *A Knight's Conjuring*, &c. (1607), p. 25 (ed. 1842); *The Dead Tearme* (1608), sig. E 2 v.

It will surprise Mr. Blackley, and superficialists of his stamp, to be told, that, before the fourteenth century, there was no *wast*, but in its stead, *were*. Dr. Morris shows this; yet, on coming to *wert*, he remarks, entirely in the old-fashioned spirit of philologizing, that it "is sometimes, but wrongly, used for the subjunctive *were* (second person singular)." *Historical Outlines of English Accidence*, pp. 181, 182. Dr. Johnson, Bishop Lowth, &c. &c., know nothing whatever of such syntax as 'if thou *were*'. And how often has it appeared in literature, within the two last centuries?

Mr. Marsh has produced passages which prove that *wast* and *wert*, as indicatives, were used contemporaneously, but with a distinction; the latter signifying 'became'. *Lectures on the English Language*, pp. 316, 317.

Ben Jonson, in treating of *was* and *were*, plainly does not intend what he says; for he implies, that they may, in all cases, be employed alternatively.

A strange substitute for *wast*, namely *werst*, is used by Hakewill, *An Apologie*, &c. (1630), p. 83. *Wart* occurs in the original draught of one of Shakespeare's plays. See *The First Sketches*, &c. (1843), pp. 16, 21, &c. The indicative 'thou *were*' lingered on during most of the sixteenth century. See Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Image of Governance* (1544), fol. 102 r: Udall, *Ralph Roister Doister* (1553), p. 33 (ed. 1869): Puttenham, *The Arte*, &c., p. 198.

perhaps for a longer period, been competing with it for the mastery.[1] Though first-class writers have,

---

It is curious how many who venture criticism of our mother-tongue show themselves unequal to what they undertake. The Rev. James Gurnhill, in *English Retraced* (1862),—a book which, with all its imperfections, I am glad to possess,—has an article on *incontinently*, for 'forthwith', regarding which he writes: "In this sense I do not recollect ever to have heard it used, although it still finds a place in our dictionaries". Of *jakes* he also tells us: "I do not know that it occurs in any other passages than the two already quoted [from the Geneva Bible]; nor have I met with it elsewhere".

What can be this gentleman's acquaintance with the living English of conversation, let alone modern books? And what his acquaintance with our older literature?

[1] Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, *Patient Grissil* (1603), p. 72 (ed. 1841). Sir Arthur Gorges, Translation of Bacon's *De Sapientia Veterum* (ed. 1619), Preface. Mabbe, *The Rogue* (ed. 1623), Part 1, p. 101. James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), pp. 35, 78. Brathwait, *The Two Lancashire Lovers* (1640), p. 231: *The English Gentleman*, &c. (ed. 1641), p. 178. Howell, *Twelve Several Treatises*, &c. (1661), p. 194. Glanvill, *Plus Ultra* (1668), p. 146. Trans. of *Il Nipotismo di Roma* (1673), Part 1, p. 109. Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 239. Sir Richard Steele, *The Guardian*, No. 144. Theophilus Cibber, *The Lover*, Act 3. Samuel Richardson, *Pamela* (ed. 1811), Vol. 2, pp. 46, 335: *Clarissa Harlowe* (ed. 1811), Vol. 2, p. 347: *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1811), Vol. 3, p. 123; Vol. 6, p. 344. Shenstone, *Letters*, No. 23. Cambridge, *The World*, No. 102. Coleman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, Nos. 71, 106. Jones, of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 2, p. 203. Foote, *The Devil upon Two Sticks*, Act 1, Scene 3. Miss Burney, *Evelina* (ed. 1779), Vol. 1, Letters 10, 25; Vol. 3, Letter 2: *Cecilia* (1782), Book 1, Ch. 9; Book 7, Ch. 6; Book 8, Ch. 7; Book 10, Ch. 8. Lady Hesketh, *Poems and Early Productions of William Cowper*, &c. (1825), p. 60. Southey, *Colloquies*, &c. (ed. 1831), Vol. 2, p. 273: *Essays, Moral and Political* (1832), Vol. 1, p. 10.

Mr. J. R. Bartlett, in his *Dictionary of Americanisms* (second ed.), p. 119, writes: "In England, the expression is 'different *to*'; and so the old English writers quoted in Richardson's *Dictionary*." Neither there, nor in any other dictionary that I know of, is a single writer, old or new, quoted for 'different *to*.'

'Different *to*' is criticized in Robert Baker's *Remarks on the English Language* (ed. 1779), p. 4. Baker calls it "an expression often used by good writers."

here and there, let 'different *to*' escape their pens,[1] it can hardly be shown, however, that any of them have given into it advertently.[2] In all probability, it has seemed to them too colloquial. Just at present, the critics are strong in their opposition to it; and no one comes forward in its defence.

Now that, like *party*, for 'person', it has descended to the vulgar,[3] it may, quite possibly, be ridiculed wholly out of respectable vogue. But the great objection to it, after all, is, that it contributes to divided usage, a thing always to be resisted, where resistance is practicable. We have, in it, most likely, one of those numerous locutions which, originating in that spontaneous aversion to dissonance which marks the easy flow of unpedantic conversation, careful writers, in observance of analogy, have not deemed worthy of dignifying by admission into the language of books. To speak of it, therefore, as belonging to the class of "gross departures from idiomatic propriety", is to pass off a verdict of personal taste, under the guise of an adjudication of science;

[1] There are cases in which 'different *to*', but not for 'different *from*', is right. "Seeing all these may bee quite otherwise altered by the constitution of the parents, by nature's work, different *to* both their constitutions," &c. John Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, p. 87.

[2] Mr. Thackeray, in *The Newcomes*, after having invariably used 'different *to*', prefers 'different *from*,' at p. 112 of Vol. 4, and thenceforward. I refer to the Tauchnitz edition.

Modern writers, as Charles Lloyd, Dr. H. Stebbing, Miss Charlotte Brontë, Mr. J. Pycroft, Mr. Thomas Hughes, &c. &c., might be quoted, for 'different *to*', by the score.

[3] "He talked kinder different *to* what I can talk." *Giles's Trip to London* (Norwich, 1871), p. 16.

Any one who has conversed with the common people of England must know that 'different *to*' is in everyday use among them. It has descended to them from their superiors.

and rational science, in matters of language, has no dependence on a priori rules. "Idiomatic propriety" is not a thing that comes down to us, ready-made, and fixed for all eternity, from the skies; and, besides, it is the tongue and ear, quite as much as the hand, by which it is determined. The English neither write nor say 'differ *to*';[1] and, hence, from a sense of symmetry, most of them, in deliberately recording their thoughts, eschew 'different *to*'.[2] If we had had a verb neuter *avert*, it may be that

[1] *Differ* may take *with*, when *in opinion*, or the like, is expressed or understood.

"If to *differ*, ever hereafter, *with* an upstart minister is to be construed", &c. John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 37. Also see Godwin, *The Enquirer*, pp. 94, 278.

In other cases, too, *differ* has sometimes taken *with*.

"Idolatry . . . *differs* but a letter *with* idiolatry." Bishop Andrewes, *Ninety-six Sermons* (ed. 1841—1844), Vol. 2, p. 393.

[2] Nor do they write or say 'differing *to*'. But just as harsh is 'disagreeing *to*'. Edward Dacres, *Machiavel's Discourses* (1636), p. 155. And the expression is found in Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), p. 91. Bentley does even worse than this. "They would. . . traduce, punish, and persecute, to the utmost, all that disagree *to* them." *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 312. Raphe Robynson has "disagreing *from*". Translation of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1551), p. 99 (ed. 1869). Glanvill has "disagree *from*". *Essays*, &c. (1676), II., p. 41.

'Difference *to*' is not entirely unknown. Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 2, p. 347. Miss Burney, *Evelina*, Vol. 2, Letter 21. Doubtless it was based on 'different *to*'.

'Difference *than*' occurs in Puttenham, *The Arte*, &c., p. 116.

We find, as the result of mere heedlessness, 'different *than*' in Addison, Steele, De Foe, Richardson, Coleman and Thornton, Miss Burney, Coleridge, Mr. De Quincey, Mr. Thackeray, and Dr. Newman. Similar are the following. 'Another *from*'. Glanvill, Uvedale Price, Lord Teignmouth, Landor, Mr. De Quincey, Mr. Dickens, Mr. Charles Reade, Mr. Matthew Arnold. 'Another *to*'. John Gaule, Addison, Miss Burney, Mr. Dickens. 'Contrary *than*'. Milton, Henry More, Steele. 'Contrary *from*'. Bp. Warburton, Graves. 'Peculiar *from*'. Dean Swift. 'Opposite *from*'. Steele, Landor. 'Inseparable *to*'. Steele. 'Anywhere *than*'. Dr. Newman. 'More *but*'. Cowper.

the influence of the preposition it would regularly have taken would have kept us from altering the 'averse *from*' of our forefathers into 'averse *to*', now generally prevalent.[1] To sum up this argument, the conclusion is, that 'different *to*' is, essentially, an English colloquialism; and, like many colloquialisms, it evinces how much stronger the instinct of euphony is than the instinct of scientific analogy.[2] In a tale of contemporary English life, to make its actors, unless they were very formal personages indeed, say anything else than 'different *to*,' would simply misrepresent facts. Mr. Marsh tells us, that, though 'different *to*' is "common in England," in America, "none but very ignorant persons would be guilty of" employing the expression. Herein are two palpable sophisms. Englishmen, for using this

---

[1] Precisely like *different* and *averse*, as to the nature of its prefix, is *dissimilar*, after which it is usual to put *to*. So it is constructed by Miss Burney, Paley, Hallam, Southey, Mr. De Quincey, Mr. J. S. Mill, and Dr. Newman; with *to* or *from*, by William Godwin and Landor; with *from* only, by Gibbon and Charles Lloyd. 'Foreign *from*' and 'foreign *to*' were long used promiscuously.

The old verb *discord* almost always took, I believe, *with*. 'Discordant *to*', which closely matches 'different *to*', has the sanction of Bp. Warburton. *A Selection from Unpublished Papers*, &c. (1841), p. 404. Barrow has 'discordant *from*'. *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 272.

[2] Formerly I inclined to another view, seeing in the *to* of 'different *to*', the implication of contrast. But this notion has no sound basis, historical or other. It would be a nice refinement, and also motiveless, that should abate the distinctness marked by the *from* of 'different *from*', into the comparative vagueness of relation expressed by the vicarious *to*. Besides this, 'different *to*', clearly enough, was never suggested by curious reflection.

I have found in Italian, where it is anomalous, what corresponds to 'different *to*.' "E, in vero, una figura di pietra sarebbe stata poco *a* lei *differente*." Rosini, *La Monaca di Monza* (ed. Pisa, 1829), Vol. 1, p. 47.

phrase, are implied to be ignorant; as if their choosing to speak like the vast majority of their educated countrymen, in preference to obeying the behests of transcendental grammarians, made them so. On the other hand, in America, it is local usage, not superior enlightenment, that accounts for the all but universal adherence to 'different *from*'; and, however it might be with followers of English precedents, the "very ignorant", least of all, would there deviate into such an exotic peculiarity as 'different *to*'.

'In respect *of*' and 'in regard *of*' are expressions which, in modern English, Mr. Marsh heartily dislikes; and most of us, I dare say, concur with him in his dislike of them. As substitutes for 'with respect *to*', 'with regard *to*', they are not seen to realize that superior precision which, on their face, they seem to promise, and which alone could make amends for their quaintness. An air of affectation and vagueness infects them, such that they may expect favour from none but persons of rather peculiar tastes;[1] and there is very little danger of their be-

[1] Dean Alford roundly asserts that 'in respect *of*' "is, certainly, as much used by good modern writers, as" 'with respect *to*'. *A Plea*, &c., p. 195. The Dean, if he had a serviceable memory, could have given no more satisfactory proof than he thus gives, of the straitened limits of his literary associations. It is noticeable, also, that he appears to be acquainted with only one sense borne by the expression, namely, that of 'as to'.

It is Scotchmen, more particularly, that affect 'in respect *of*', now-a-days. Lord Macaulay, in all his writings, has used it only twice, I think. To pass to entire Englishmen, but few of them, in the first half of this century, have the expression. For an instance in Southey, see his *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, p. 435. Mr. De Quincey sometimes gave into it. See his *Works*, Vol. 11, pp. 13, 177, 256: *The Logic of Political Economy* (ed. 1844), p. 34.

coming popular. But Mr. Marsh rejects them on other grounds than expediential and æsthetic. Part of his polemic against them I transcribe. Having spoken of the preference given, by Coleridge [1] and his imitators, to this style of phraseology, he goes on to say:

"It rests, of course, on the theory, that, in this phrase, *respect* or *regard* is an independent noun, and, therefore, should be followed by the preposition *of*. But this, I think, is a mistaken view of the subject. The word *respect*, in this combination, has none of the meanings known to [*sic*] [2] it, as an independent noun, in the English vocabulary. The expression *in or with respect* is an idiotism, a phraseological construction of an adverbial character; and, in its ordinary modern use, it is the equivalent of 'relatively'. Old writers sometimes say *respectively to*. This is now disused; but *relatively to* is by no means unfrequent; and 'in respect *of*', used in this sense, is just as gross a violation of English grammar as to write 'relatively *of*', or 'in reference *of*'." [3]

Here we again find Mr. Marsh on the confines of Olympus. 'In respect *of*', to mean 'relatively to',

---

[1] Coleridge is admitted, on all hands, to have been mainly influential in revivifying the locution—well nigh moribund, when he began his career,—which is here discussed. And it is characteristic of him.

[2] A Lord Grenville of former days wrote of "a long and destructive warfare, of a nature long since unknown *to* the practice of civilized nations." Here, remarks Coleridge, "the word *to* is absurdly used for the word *in*." *Essays on His Own Times*, p. 262. Not unlike the nobleman's "unknown *to*", the context considered, is Mr. Marsh's "known *to*".

[3] *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 661.

he knows to have been, for a very considerable period, accepted English; and he himself quotes Bacon for it. Nevertheless, it is, he declares, "a gross violation of English grammar". What, then, constitutes grammatical orthopraxy? If it is not dependent on usage, it behoves Mr. Marsh to acquaint us from what philologically accredited region of the firmament he draws down the laws by which it is governed.[1]

The argument furnished by Mr. Marsh, in support of their choice, to those who elect 'in respect *of*', is one which, in its totality, most unquestionably they would not urge. Though they took up the positions, which they well might take up, that, in this phrase, *respect* is "an independent noun", and that it signifies 'relation', 'reference', still they would not contend that it "therefore should be fol-

[1] Mr. Marsh's selection of illustration, in order to bring out the alleged analogical absurdity of 'in respect *of*', betokens a most peculiar estimate of grammaticalness. He cannot place side by side with 'in respect *of*', some kindred obsoletism; because any obsoletism, it seems, is equally bad grammar. The resulting parallelism would be like the testimony of the left hand against the right. Good grammar, it follows, is ascertained by the best usage contemporaneously current; barbarizing whatever is disused, and destined, in turn, to be, itself, barbarized by whatever supersedes it, in time to come. Of living grammar, of good grammar for us, this is a correct conception; and it is perfectly fair to try by it any form of phrase found in writings of our own age. But Mr. Marsh, in passing sentence on 'in respect *of*', takes his stand on an idea of grammar which evacuates the bygone usage of our ancestors of all authority to determine what it was right that they should say; since he classes their 'in respect *of*', for 'with respect *to*', absolutely, among "incorrect forms" and "inexpressive syntactical combinations", and calls it "a mere grammatical crotchet" and a "mere violation of a grammatical rule". Poor ancestors! And how can Mr. Marsh deny to our descendants the right *of insisting*, in like manner, that we, too, were imbeciles?

lowed by the preposition *of* ".[1] For, alike in old English and in modern, *relation* and *reference* take *to* after them, not *of*,[2] in an objective construction, the construction here contemplated.[3]

---

[1] "Nobody ever thinks of saying 'in reference *of*'; but, if these phrases are to be governed by the rules of English construction of nouns, there is as good ground for this expression as for 'in respect *of*'. The Latin etymology of *respect* has nothing to do with the question; for the Latin primitive [*sic*] was not used for any such purpose, or in any such construction; and the phrase in question is strictly an English idiotism."

So writes Mr. Marsh, in a foot-note; and he is quite right in holding that the construction of *respectus* is no precedent for the construction of *respect*. But his doctrine as to the way we should construct our substantives is not very intelligible. Is it, that *of* should be restricted to the expression of subjectivity? If so, 'love *of* money' is wrong, since money does not love; and the adnominal 'city *of* Rome' keeps it company, Rome not denoting an action known as 'city'.

[2] Exceptions should be noted; and here is one. "They intreated the doctor to make a more particular explication of whatsoever he had spoken *in reference of* the passions to musick", &c. *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 11, p. 27.

[3] In St. James, 2, 9, and I. St. Peter, 1, 17,—in both which places, *respect* means 'partial consideration',—we have "*respect to* persons" and "*respect of* persons". Even from these phrases, which are synonymous, it is seen how freely we allowed ourselves, formerly, an option, in the matter of prepositions.

Old authors also have 'to value *of* a rush', 'to glory *of*', 'remorse *of* sin', 'born *of* a woman', 'to depend *of*', 'to tax *of*', where, displacing *of*, we now put *at, in, for, from, on, with*. Add, 'independent *from* or *on*', 'ingredient *into*', 'contemporary *to*', 'equivalent *with*', &c. &c. Almost every preposition, in fact, once was used where it is used no longer. All the archaic locutions adduced above, with thousands more, are to be stigmatized as ungrammatical, if 'in respect *of*' may broadly be so branded.

With respect of, like anything else, would have been good English, if people had only voted strongly enough for it. Dean Alford says that this combination, "unless I am mistaken, is not found". "*With respect of* our owne profit" occurs in *The Honey-combe of Free Justification* (1642), by John Eaton, p. 472. And here is an instance of it, still older, and one of *with regard of*. "But the king's mother,

And on what kind of research, and on how much, did Mr. Marsh base his constructive assertion, that the substantive *respect*, elsewhere than in phraseological combinations, does not import 'relation', 'reference'? I should judge, that, for conviction on this head, he thought it enough to look into Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary*.[1] Inasmuch as the verb *respect*

---

travelling incessantly betweene the king and the duke, ... laboured them both to a reconcilement; the king, *with regard of* the dangerous and discontented times; the duke, *with respect of* his duty and faith." Sir John Hayward, *The First Part of the Life and Reigne of King Henrie the IIII.* (1599), p. 7.

[1] Under Dr. Johnson's ninth definition of *respect*, "relation, regard", five passages are quoted. In four of them, the word defined is embedded in the expressions *in respect of* and *with respect to*; and the remaining passage is out of place, since *respect*, in its "in many *respects*", has a very different meaning from that assigned to it. I now proceed with my citations.

"Consultation hath *respect* to the time future or to come; that is to say, the end or purpose thereof is adressed to some act or affaire to be practised after their consultation." Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Governour* (1531), fol. 211 (ed. 1580).

"Nothing is good, I see, without *respect*."
Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act 5, Sc. 1.

"In the infancie of the church, ... Christians flourished not, either in number, or in wealth, or in authoritie; and, therefore, Saint Paul had onely *respect* of those to whom he writ, . . . and ment not that his precept should be held for a perpetuall lawe." William Watson, *A Decacordon*, &c. (1602), p. 298.

"Therefore those positive lawes that doe soe severely punish the actuall breaches of the second Table, without any *respect* to the sinnes that are committed against the first, were rather sette downe by the policies of men, then by the rule of the written word of God." Barnabe Riche, *The Honestie of This Age* (1614), p. 56 (ed. 1844).

"So that all these foure places have one *respect* and ayme; and none of them look towards our question." Dr. Donne, *Biathanatos* (1st ed., undated), p. 160.

"What I aime at, in it, I confesse, hath most *respect* to my selfe." Feltham, *Resolves*, &c. (ed. 1628), First Centurie, To the Peruser.

"*Every* taske, labour, or imployment must have reference and

is synonymous with *relate to* and *refer to*, a little deliberation ought to suggest, quite abstractedly

---

respect to some end." Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, &c. (ed. 1641), p. 162. Also see p. 187.

"Insomuch as some interpreters conceive it not improbable that Solomon, in this place, might have *respect* to those regal and sacerdotal anointings," &c. Bp. Sanderson, *Sermons* (ed. 1681), Vol. 2, p. 5. Also see p. 211.

"Must church-government that is appointed in the Gospel, and has chief *respect* to the soul, be conformable and pliant to civil . . . . ?" Milton, *Prose Works* (Bohn's ed.), Vol. 2, p. 392.

"That administration of the people did consist in three functions, prophetical, regal, sacerdotal; all which had *respect* unto the Messias," &c. Bp. Pearson, *An Exposition of the Creed* (ed. 1845), p. 149.

"The weakness of which argumentation consists in supposing that those variable *respects* of before and after are realities in nature." Glanvill, *Scire Tuum Nihil Est* (ed. 1665), p. 65. Also see *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), p. 61: *Essays*, &c. (1676), IV., p. 39: *Lux Orientalis* (ed. 1682), p. 12: Letter prefixed to Bp. Rust's *A Discourse of Truth*.

"Matter is the same with body, but never without *respect* to a body which is made thereof." Hobbes, *Works* (ed. Sir W. Molesworth), Vol. 4, p. 309.

"Local and temporal, implying a *respect* betwixt something absent and past, either to that which is present, or to that which is at distance and future." Bp. Wilkins, *An Essay Towards a Real Character*, &c. (1668), p. 313. Also see pp. 28, 29, 31, 35, 37, 316, 319, 338, 411, 412.

"By the first [kind of truth] I mean nothing else but that things necessarily are what they are; by the second, that there are necessary mutual *respects* and relations of things, one unto another." Bp. Rust, *A Discourse of Truth* (1682), Sec. I. And see this little work throughout.

"Therefore that idea must have the same properties and *respects* for ever." Henry More, *Annotations upon 'Lux Orientalis,'* &c. (1682), p. 19. Many other references to this work might be given. Also see *The Mystery of Godliness* (ed. 1660), p. 180.

"Seeing, therefore, the observation of the Sabbath is expressed to have a peculiar *respect* to the children of Israel, as a sign of the covenant made with them, when he led them out of Egypt," &c. Barrow, *Works* (ed. 1683—1692), Vol. 1, p. 525. Also see Vol. 1, p. 518; Vol. 2, pp. 62, 65, 93, 102, 269, 361, 520.

"And Antiochus, perhaps, might have a *respect* to this doctrine, when

from consultation of dictionaries, that the substantive *respect* had, probably, been employed for 'relation',

---

he put ἡλικία," &c. Bentley, *Works* (ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce), Vol. 1, p. 124. Also see *The Correspondence of Richard Bentley, D.D.*, p. 413.

An anonymous contributor to *The Spectator*, No. 551, sending a translation of an epigram on Menander, beginning with this couplet,

> "The very bees, O sweet Menander, hung,
> To taste the Muses' spring, upon thy tongue",

begins his comment on it in these words: "This epigram has a *respect* to the character of its subject; for Menander writ remarkably with a justness and purity of language."

"If so, it shows why the trial was made; why it was the last trial; for it rendered Abraham's faith complete, and had *respect* to the great end of all the promises." Bp. Warburton, *A Selection*, &c., p. 89.

"All these quotations solely respect the parliament immediately preceding that of 1679, and have no *respect* to any subsequent parliament whatever." John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 36.

"And the warning of the prophet had a principal *respect* to the Jews, also, who were too much inclined to depend upon the assistance of Egypt." Bp. Lowth, *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Notes, p. 117.

"This circumstance of the place has *respect* to the temptation of the Israelites." Jones of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 2, p. 214.

"These questions, then, have direct *respect* to the rule and character which is to mark your instructions of your people, so far as the office of a teacher is committed to you." Bp. Wilberforce, *Addresses*, &c. (ed. 1860), p. 37.

Many more similar passages are at hand. Here are references to a few. Thomas Gataker, *Of the Nature and Use of Lots* (ed. 1627), p. 114. Dr. John Cowell, *The Interpreter* (ed. 1637), sig. A 4 *verso*. Mabbe, *The Rogue* (ed. 1623), Part 2, p. 274. John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification* (1642), pp. 70, 188. Matthew Lawrence, *The Use and Practice of Faith* (1657), p. 44. John Smith, *The Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd* (1657), p. 237. Hamon L'Estrange, *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), p. 213. Charles Johnson, *Chrysal* (ed. 1777), Vol. 2, p. 12.

Dr. Johnson, under *regard*, in the sense of "relation, reference", quotes only two passages; and they are not quite satisfactory, as rather exemplifying the phrases *with regard of* and *with regard to*. The following quotations are more in point.

"Such as, in the Netherlands, have written, have . . . had *regard unto their* only used speech, whereas, in deed, the understanding of the

'reference'. Both by reason of what they include, and of what they omit, the very best of English dictionaries are most misleading. However, to justify the old-fashioned 'in respect *of*', we might even dispense with inquiring what significations formerly attached to *respect*, in other contexts.[1] Had it meant 'poker', 'shovel', and 'tongs', still the concretion 'in respect *of*', and, equally, in 'respect *from*', or 'in respect *against*', once established in any sense or senses whatsoever, would, so long as it continued thus established, have been good legitimate English.

"*In or with respect*", we are instructed, "is an idiotism, a phraseological construction of an adverbial character," &c.[2] *In comparison*, the same as 'compara-

---

Teutonic, used of our Saxon anceters, as also that of the ancient Francks, is most requisite, and thereunto the present High, Low, and Eastlandish Teutonic, together, with *respect* unto the dependant Danish and Swedish, besydes our modern vulgar English." Verstegan, *A Restitution*, &c. (ed. 1605), The Epistle, &c., *ad finem*.

"And though I deny not but this Father might have chief *regard* to Christ, the mystical bread which came down from Heaven, yet doth not that hinder but he might also allude to what was then matter of fact in the celebration of the eucharist." Hamon L'Estrange, *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), p. 175.

"That God Almighty should erect this stately fabrick of heaven and earth, decked with so rich and goodly furniture, with especial *regard* to man, so puny and mean a creature," &c. Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 26. Also see pp. 94, 143, 220.

Addison tells of a man who, on reading the Biblical statistics of the ages of Adam, Seth, and Methuselah, with the words "and he died" at the end of each item, "immediately shut himself up in a convent, and retired from the world, as not thinking anything in this life worth pursuing, which had not *regard* to another." *The Spectator*, No. 289.

[1] *In fine* is English; but hardly has *fine*, for 'end', ever been so, I believe.

[2] 'In respect *to*' and 'with respect *to*' Mr. Marsh approves, and he

tively', is a real specimen of an adverbial phrase, as in the sentence: "Where the whole power of Israel, 400,000 strong, . . . fell before a few Benjamites, a small handful, *in comparison*", &c.[1] But *in respect* or *with respect* is not, "in its ordinary modern use, . . the equivalent of 'relatively'." Who says that 'up' and 'down' denote direction '*in respect*, not absolutely'?[2]

---

deems it incumbent on him to render a reason for his approval of them. If he had been aware that *respect* has, among its significations, 'relation', 'reference', we may be sure he would not have resorted to the gratuitous speculation which he foists on us, as if fact. But see note 2 in this page.

[1] Bishop Andrewes, *Ninety-six Sermons* (ed. 1841-4), Vol. 1, p. 330. Add *in consequence*, for 'consequently'. See, for instances, Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 381: Southey, *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, pp. 133, 383.

[2] Mr. Marsh, avowedly knowing nothing of the existence of *respect*, in the sense of 'relation', 'reference', and thus having no historical explanation of 'in respect *of*', boldly dogmatizes, and lays down that *in respect* or *with respect* is "an idiotism", &c. &c.; and, a base being thus obtained, one has only to tack to it the appropriate preposition, in order to come by our *in respect to*, *with respect to*. But proof that his base was ever in use he gives none; and it appears to be, with him, purely hypothetical. Further, to the *respect* which it envelopes he abstains from attaching any definite meaning. This base we are to take as a whole, and be thankful. Moreover, it is altogether arbitrary, in him, to legislate that this base can, in propriety, be eked out by no preposition but *to*; no more scientific reason than his personal perception of the fitness of things conducting him to this conclusion. Philology of this autocratic stamp can scarcely hope, after disclosure of what it assumes and implies, to win many adherents.

The phrases *in respect* and *with respect*, for 'relatively', &c., are, I apprehend, rare; and, if only because of their rarity, it is highly unlikely that they generated 'in respect *of*', 'with respect *to*', &c. The latter of them—though I have quoted Shakespeare's *without respect*: see the note in p. 88, *supra*,—I have nowhere chanced upon. Of the former I subjoin instances.

"For that part of Affricke hath but of late received the name of Burbarie; and some others rather thinke, that of this word Barbarous *that countrey* came to be called Barbaria, and but few yeares, *in re-*

Mr. Marsh's decision, touching 'in respect *of*', is, that, to signify 'relatively to', it "is just as gross a

---

spect, agone." Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), p. 210 (ed. 1811).

"He was a man; this, *in respect*, a child."
Shakespeare, *Third Part of King Henry VI.*, Act 5, Scene 5.

"Onely the meanes by others must be wrought,
Which, *in respect*, are trifles, things of nought."
Samuel Rowlands, *The Four Knaves* (1600—1612?), p. 50 (ed. 1844).

"He attributed unto it one onely desire, or first motion, simplie or absolutelie, and another, comparativelie or *in respect*." Sir Arthur Gorges, Translation of Bacon's *De Sapientia Veterum* (ed. 1619), pp. 80, 81.

And compare the following: "Ye, howe wonderfully dyd a fewe Romayns, *in regarde*, not only defende this litel territory agaynst the great numbre and puissance of dyvers and sundry people," &c. Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Image of Governance* (ed. 1544), fol. 62 v.

"And, for crabs, lobsters, perewinkles, &c., *in regard* so plentiful and common, are but of little value." Richard Franck, *Northern Memoirs* (ed. 1694), p. 181.

In regard, here, as in the passage from Sir Thomas Elyot, imports 'comparatively'. Further, by an obsolete idiom, "for . . . are" is for 'as for . . . they are'. And similarly interpret "for . . . . for . . . have," in p. 6, *supra*, lines 12, 13; and compare the passage from Ascham in p. 47, *supra*.

Respective and *respectively*, when meaning 'relative' and 'relatively', I may, also, as well exemplify.

"Heat, as concerning the humane sense of feeling, is a various and *respective* thing." R. G., *The Naturall and Experimentall History of Winds*, &c. (1653), p. 275. This work is translated from Bacon's Latin.

Also see Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, p. 209.

"The evils of sin are of two sorts. Some are evill formally, simply, and per se . . . . . Othersome are evill onely *respectively*, and by accident, but otherwise, in their owne nature, indifferent." Bishop Sanderson, *Twelve Sermons* (1637), p. 56. "*Respectively* to the justice of God", "*respectively* to God's justice". *Id.*, *ibid.*, pp. 335, 337.

"An whole Church or nation is not justified absolutely, but *respectively*." John Eaton, *The Honey-combe*, &c., p. 92.

See, further, Heylin, *A Full Relation*, &c. (ed. 1656), To the Reader.

Respective and *respectively*, for 'due' and 'duly', though they were once very common, are not noticed by Dr. Johnson and his successors.

violation of English grammar as to write 'relatively *of*', or 'in reference *of*'." That may, in one age, be English grammar, which is not so in another age; for every age has its own standard of the grammatical. It is, however, going beyond a rejection of this undeniable truth, to compare 'in respect *of*' with 'relatively *of*' or 'in reference *of*'. The former was, during many generations, used by the best writers; whereas, with regard to the latter expressions, Mr. Marsh does not even pretend that they have ever appeared in literature, or that they are anything but theoretic anomalies.[1] That they did not become English, while 'independently *of*' and 'irrespectively *of*' did become English, was simply from unaccountable fortuity; and no more scrutable reason why they were not vernacularized can be given, than that they were not vernacularized. 'In comparison *of*', which is still, to some extent, current, ought to be equally bad English with 'in respect *of*', in the eyes of Mr. Marsh.

Against 'in respect *of*', in modern use, the only maintainable objections are, therefore, its quaintness and its ambiguity. It is just the kind of phrase to be petted, as it is, by certain affectationists.[2] In old

[1] I am very far from saying that they may not have got into print again and again. And, after all, 'relatively *of*' is no stranger than 'in relation *of*', for 'with reference *to*', exemplified in the following extract from a letter bearing the date of 1652.

"The whole island [of Jersey] is generally ruled by the great court, so called *in relation of* inferior courts, of which hereafter mention shall be made," &c. N. Lempriere, in *Memorials of the Great Civil War*, &c. (1842), Vol. 2, p. 405.

[2] In the next note, Mr. Marsh is quoted as objecting to 'in respect *of*', that it is employed in three senses. 'In respect *to*' has two

times, we had 'compliance *to*' and 'in compliance *to*'; and, at present, *with* is here our preposition. Similarly, as *respect*, for 'relation', 'reference', once took, in objective constructions, *of*, and now takes only *to*, it is better for us, analogically,—as it is better, if we would adhere to the preponderant usage of our contemporaries,—to say 'in respect *to*,' or 'with respect *to*'.[1]

---

senses, to be sure; but it is always clear, from the context, which of them is intended. It is never made synonymous with 'by reason of'; and the attachment of this sense to 'in respect *of*', by late writers, is, not unfrequently, designed to perplex, apparently, rather than to enlighten.

[1] Our contemporary affecters of 'in respect *of*', as Mr. Marsh justly says, are, for the most part, "so anxious to parade it, as a badge of the style of a school, that they drag it in on all occasions where they can, by any chance, contrive to introduce it; very often employing it in constructions that leave it difficult to determine whether they mean 'relatively to', or 'by reason of', or 'in point of'; and the vague use of the phrase, of course, tends to embarrass the reader by confounding, in expression, things logically very distinct."

And this leads me to append a few words on the phrase, in the sense of 'in point of'. In a former note, I have alluded to a passage from Tillotson, which Dr. Johnson cites inappositely. It is this: "Everything which is imperfect, as the world must be acknowledged in many *respects*, had some cause which produced it." *Respect* here denotes 'point'; and it often occurs in the kindred senses,—unrecognized, like that just mentioned, by Mr. Marsh and the dictionaries,—of 'object of contemplation', 'particular', 'matter', 'article', 'thing', and the like. Cowper writes, describing Mr. Throckmorton: "*In point of* information upon all important subjects, *in respect*, too, *of* expression and address, and, in short, everything that enters into the idea of a gentleman, I have not found his equal, not often, anywhere." *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 88. 'In respect *of*', for 'in point of', here used in connexion with it, and instead of it, just to avoid repeating the phrase, is not, then, a creation of our century.

But a long detail would be required for an exhibition of all the shades of meaning which, in the antique 'in respect *of*', appertain to *respect*, a word comparable, for its multivocalness, with the Latin *ratio*. Of the vagueness of the phrase in question there is sufficient proof in the fact,—to go no further,—that it had, among its numerous significa-

One may gravely doubt whether those who hazard such statements as have been adduced, or those who receive them, often apprehend distinctly the postulates which they involve.[1] That such statements are largely taken on trust is evident from the paucity of the contradictions which they provoke. Yet, to risk a negative, expressed or implied, if perilous in any case, is, above all, perilous, when it concerns an article of language. Even the most learned among us know, at present, but little of the history of the words and idioms which make up our speech. Who has read so much as a thousandth part of the English on the shelves of the British Museum? Thus much in bulk, provided it embraced the choicest and most characteristic portion of our literature, would furnish, if duly explored, something like a trustworthy dictionary, a thing never to be expected, save as the result of extensive cooperation, and judicious subdivision of labour. In the mean time, it can become no one who values himself on possessing ordinary

---

tions, those of 'by means of', 'on account of', and 'in consequence of'; thus sometimes directing the attention especially to the consideration of cause, sometimes pointing to a ratiocinative justification, and sometimes signalizing the aspect of effect or result.

Mr. Marsh enumerates three groups of senses,—and they comprehend the main senses,—which 'in respect *of*' once bore. The history that he gives of their fortunes does not affect my argument; and, therefore, without going into particulars, I only remark on it, that my own acquaintance with English literature leads me to conclusions somewhat at variance with his.

[1] Bentley writes to John Evelyn, April 21, 1698: "I remember you told me the person that first used the word *foreign* in English. Pray write the story and his name." *The Correspondence of Richard Bentley, D.D.*, p. 168.

How could either of these learned men believe such a thing to be *ascertainable?*

prudence, to imitate examples which a moment's reflection should suffice to discredit. Not to mention the English of any bygone period, to master exhaustively the English of our own time is beyond the competency of any one man; and, except where the age of a word or phrase is strictly defined by some chronological circumstance, as its derivation from the proper name of some celebrity, who shall say, with certainty, whether it is old or new, or an antique proposed for fresh circulation? In all these and such-like matters, theories and positive assertions are much more wisely left unventured. Philology is no province of ecclesiastics; it is not a species of theology, half dogmatism and half denunciation. Its materials are facts which admit of rigid verification; and its processes are simple applications of common-sense.

CHAPTER IV.

PURISM.

Vetera extollimus, recentium incuriosi.
Tacitus.

As some words, instinctively avoided, are constantly falling into desuetude, so others, often answering to calls too subtile for analysis, are constantly presenting themselves as postulants for recognition. The generality of those which are accepted grow into common use wholly unchallenged as to their pretensions, and are practically old before they are found out to be new; their naturalness of aspect being such, that, from the very first, they are not perceived to be other than old acquaintances. A certain minority, however, are, too frequently, scouted on the sole avowed ground of their being strangers, and are spurned with an impatience which refuses even to scan their credentials dispassionately. There is a dim and undefined idea, too, that their introducers deserve the imputation of conceit, or of presumption. Why should they flatter themselves that they have had the twofold fortune to detect a real desideratum and to supply it? Yet, as a positively futile word is pretty sure, in our time, to get its deserts quite irrespectively of clamour, no interests could take harm, if critics were to forbear violent speech about it; and its proposer, after all, has only done what our greatest writers, to a man, have been doing time out of

Univers MICHIGA

mind. "It should be understood," says Campe, "that those who hazard innovations do not set up for lawgivers in language: they only exercise a right which every good citizen, in a free state, is eager to exercise,—that of drawing the public attention to a project of reform, the rejection or adoption of which he contentedly abandons to the general will, to the suffrages of the majority of the literary republic."[1] This is good sense, assuredly; and yet such innovators, and their devices with them, may almost always calculate on being objects of disapprobation and protest, if not of ridicule. Cowper speaks of some one as having "much the same aversion to a Papist that some people have to a cat,—rather an antipathy than a reasonable dislike." Among the educated, and, in especial, among the most highly educated, the same sort of feeling, with regard to neoteric expressions, seems to be sedulously instilled, and, by many, is reputed a mark of liberal training. With them, as with Bacon, "the novelty and strangeness of terms" rank "among the badges of suspected and falsified science."

The habit of denouncing new words indiscriminately, which too many scholars appear to consider as an argument of true scholarship, has been derived to us from the Roman classics. "I suspect", says Lord Lytton, "that every great writer of a nation a little corrupts its tongue. His knowledge suggests additions and graces from other tongues;

[1] *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 21 (1796), p. 513. The translation is by William Taylor.

his genius applies and makes them popular."[1] And he goes on to instance Milton, Voltaire,[2] La Fontaine, and others, as furnishing justification of his dictum. And this we have from one who figures, without risk of rivalry, as the most wholesale and popularly influential corrupter of our language that modern days have produced.[3] Do languages, then, sometimes burst upon the world incorrupt, as Minerva issued fully equipped from the brain of Jove? Lord Lytton, as his own attempts at improving English demonstrate, must have relinquished his theory,

[1] *England and the English* (ed. 1833), Vol. 2, p. 129.

[2] It has been asserted that Voltaire "did not dare, in his numerous compositions, to add a word or expression, or even to hazard one of a preceding author, however approved, because it had not the sanction of the Academy." William Dupré, *Lexicographia Neologica Gallica* (1801), Preface, p. xiv.

On the other hand, M. Francis Wey gives, as neoterisms sanctioned by Voltaire, *autocratrice, berneur, brûlable, butorderie, calomniographe, débarbariser, décideur, découvreur, dépersécuter, déthiarer, douteur, fatuisme, histrionique, infaisable, injouable, insecouable, invendu, mirifique, pamphlétier, patauger, tragédien, vagissement, velcherie. Remarques sur la Langue Française*, &c., Vol. 1, pp. 177—184.

By some of these words the French language was, unquestionably, enriched. But it derived no amelioration from such spellings as *clé, enfans, tems*, and the like, which Voltaire gave his adhesion to, notwithstanding his expressed opinion, that "c'est le propre des barbares d'abréger tous les mots."

That Voltaire did not regard French as incapable of further improvement is plain enough from the saying attributed to him: "Notre langue est une gueuse fière; il faut lui faire l'aumône malgré elle."

[3] Lord Lytton, in his *What will he do with it?*, makes Colonel Morley groan out against *telegram*: "Oh that I should live to see such a word introduced into the English language!" There is a repulsive affectedness in this, seeing whom it comes from,—a writer that has given his countenance to *borealian, phantasmalian, superweening, viparious*, and scores more of monstrosities full as *nefast*, and as little *manipular*. It was the like of this jargon that enraged Panta*gruel to exclaim*: "Que diable de languaige est cecy! Par Dieu, tu *es quelque hereticque.*"

that he can lay his finger on any past stage of our speech, as that which ought to have been its final form. If, further, it be a characteristic of a great writer to corrupt his mother-tongue a little, Lord Lytton, unless just the reverse of such a writer, must be a very great one indeed. Against the lack of discernment betrayed in the preceding quotation may be set the comment of Hallam, who, adverting to the first half of the seventeenth century, remarks, that "the French were very strong in translations from the classical writers; and to this they are, certainly, much indebted for the purity and correctness which they reached in their own language."[1] As to ourselves, a student must be exceedingly inobservant, not to have perceived how deeply we are beholden to the happy daring of translators for the amplitude and variety of our diction, and for the flexibility of our constructions.[2]

---

[1] *Introduction to the Literature of Europe* (ed. 1847), Vol. 3, p. 135.

[2] "The great pest of speech is frequency of translation," says Dr. Johnson, in the Preface to his *Dictionary;* and, still more absurdly, he adds the wish, that, if we ever have an English Academy, its members, "instead of compiling grammars and dictionaries," may "endeavour, with all their influence, to stop the licence of translators, whose idleness and ignorance, if it be suffered to proceed, will reduce us to babble a dialect of France."

Southey says, in part very disputably, that translators, "in later times, have corrupted our idiom as much as, in early ones, they enriched our vocabulary." *Colloquies*, &c. (ed. 1831), Vol. 2, p. 297.

"An eminent prelate of our Church" is quoted, by Eusden, as saying: "There is no way of writing so proper for the refining and polishing a language, as the translating of books into it, if he who undertakes it has a competent skill of the one tongue, and is a master of the other. . . . . The French took no ill method, when they intended to reform and beautify their language, in setting their best

"I conceive," says Hazlitt, "that words are like money, not the worse for being common, but that it is the stamp of custom alone that gives them circulation or value. I am fastidious in this respect, and would almost as soon coin the currency of the realm as counterfeit the king's English. I never invented, or gave a new and unauthorized meaning to, any word but one single one,—the term *impersonal*, applied to feelings; — and that was in an abstruse metaphysical discussion, to express a very difficult distinction."[1] But, if the decisions of custom are not to be referred, in the mass, to a fixed chronological point, like the birth of a philosopher, or the extinction of a tyrant, why should this original and ingenious dissertator have chosen to invest himself in a strait-jacket, and to deny himself the permission which almost every real thinker, in every age, has, probably, challenged to himself?

I offer no apology for introducing the following, from the pen of the enlightened and liberal Archdeacon Hare:

"Though our language, like everything, and, indeed, more, almost, than anything else which we have inherited from our ancestors, is to be regarded with dutiful veneration, that veneration is not to be merely passive,—in which case, it would soon degenerate into idolatry,—but active. It is not to be put aside and lockt up as an heirloom, but to be employed, and cultivated, and improved, as an estate.

---

writers on work to translate the Greek and Latin authors into it." *The Guardian*, No. 164.

[1] *Table-talk* (ed. 1846), Vol. 2, pp. 115, 116.

We are to uphold our native language, but not the impurities it may, in course of time, have contracted from ignorance, or indolence, or caprice. On the contrary, we uphold it best, by freeing it from these impurities. We are to call forth its plastic powers, and to adapt it to the new ideas it is to clothe. Like magic armour, it will fit every form and stature. The only requisite is, that he who puts it on should be a true knight."[1]

Not for every one, however, would it, by any means, do to invent terms for himself, or even to venture on any but such as have become well established; and it is far too common, now-a-days, for young men, directly on being made free of a magazine, or of a newspaper, to commence word-coiners. Gray[2] writes to Dr. Beattie: "I would not make

---

[1] *The Philological Museum*, Vol. 1 (1832), pp. 645, 646.

[2] "'Anti*que*' is the worst portion of Gray's heritage. . . . . In honest truth, we neither have, nor had then, a better and purer writer than he, although he lived in the time of the purest and best, Goldsmith, Sterne, Fielding, and Inchbald." Landor, *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 107.

Further, as to our vernacular at its best, writing to Mr. Henry Crabb Robinson,—see his *Diary*, &c., Vol. 2, pp. 521, 522,—he says, regarding *Elia's Essays*, by Charles Lamb: "The papers are admirable; the language, truly English. We have none better, new or old."

Who but Landor, in recent times, would have objected to "anti*que*"? Letting this pass, as Johnson, after recognizing but one set of "wells of English undefiled", admitted the existence of others, so Landor, forgetting that he had restricted the perfection of our language to the days of Queen Elizabeth and James I., first extended its duration to the time of Milton, and then substituted, in place of both those periods, the second half of the last century. *Vide supra*, pp. 10, and 13, 14.

But is Gray's English, from the ordinary point of view, altogether faultless? Look at his verbs *combustle*, *deballate*, *enmarvail*, *undefeat*; his substantives *agreeability*, *criticality*, *leucocholy*, *perfectionment*,

new words, without great necessity: it is very hazardous, at best."[1] On this remark, which is cited only for the sake of its pendant, the learned Scotchman annotates: "I would as soon make new coin as knowingly make a new word, except I were to invent any art or science where they would be necessary." Undoubtedly, it was prudent, in Dr. Beattie, if he would deliver himself in a foreign language,—and even this was beyond his power,—simply to take it, to the best of his ability, as he found it.[2]

---

rinfrescative, zealotism; his adjectives *inutile, marturient, verisimile;* his *anent;* his preterites *begun, run,* and *throwed;* and his past participles *broke, chose,* and *wrote.* Add his *deduct* for 'deduce', *perform* for 'erect', *set* for 'sit'; *power* for 'quantity'; *bad* for 'sick', *better* for 'more', *like* for 'likely'; *a cherubim;* "none but *they*", "nobody but *I*"; "I have seen nothing, *neither*"; "nor drink out of *nothing* but"; "everybody . . . *them*".

In his *Progress of Poesy*, furthermore, he violates all idiom by writing:

> "Her track, where'er the goddess roves,
> Glory *pursue*, and generous Shame".

[1] *Works* (ed. Mitford, 1858), Vol. 4, p. 311.

[2] Speaking of the injury which our language has received, from various quarters, in recent times, Southey says, that, "to this injury the Scotch have greatly contributed; for, composing in a language which is not their mother-tongue, they necessarily acquire an artificial and formal style, which,—not so much through the merit of a few, as owing to the perseverance of others, who, for half a century, seated themselves on the bench of criticism,—has almost superseded the vernacular English of Addison and Swift." *Colloquies*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 297.

According to Dr. Priestley, under the date of 1761, "he must be prejudiced to a degree that deserves ridicule, who will not allow that several of the most correct writers of English are Scotsmen." *The Rudiments of English Grammar*, &c., p. 6.

"Why", much more critically, asks an anonymous writer, "why should a Scotsman, who is ashamed of nothing else belonging to his country, be ashamed of its dialect? It is to English what the Doric was to pure Greek,—adorned with rustic graces which have long been

We can easily believe, if only on the showing of the single sentence here quoted from him, that English would have undergone no improvement at his hands. Townley and Beckford are not known to have attempted any reforms or additions in French; Milton, Mathias, and Landor attempted none, I believe, in Italian; and Dr. Beattie's self-distrust, just like theirs, may be commended, as a safe precedent, to the mob of neoterists.

Thousands of words and uses of words, on their first appearance, or revival, as candidates for vernacularization, must have met with repugnance, expressed or unexpressed.[1] As for those to which re-

---

felt and acknowledged in the poetry of that country. Why, then, should it not be tolerated in history, especially since experience has shewn, that no efforts of their best writers have been able wholly to avoid it?" *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 9 (1813), p. 433.

Would that this well-meant interrogatory advice were taken. Of its soundness I am constantly reminded afresh and afresh. To take a certain London journal of wide circulation, *The Daily News*, what reader of it, unless a thorough trans-Tweedian in his conceptions of the British tongue, but must wish that it spontaneously practised broad Scotch, instead of vainly attempting English? Unless trained, from his very infancy, in the use of our language, a Scotchman who tries to write it is pretty sure to reveal his nationality in less time than—to speak with Sydney Smith,—he takes to scratch himself.

[1] "It would form an interesting essay, or, rather, series of essays, in a periodical work, were all the attempts to ridicule new phrases brought together, the proportion observed of words ridiculed which have been adopted, and are now common,—such as *strenuous*, *conscious*, &c.,—and a trial made how far any grounds can be detected, so that one might determine beforehand whether a word was invented under the conditions of assimilability to our language, or not. Thus much is certain, that the ridiculers were as often wrong as right; and Shakespeare himself could not prevent the naturalization of *accommodation*, *remuneration*, &c., or Swift, the gross abuse even of the word *idea*." Coleridge, *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare*, &c., Vol. I, pp. 275, 276.

pugnance was expressed, when they were unfamiliar, or actually new, or were taken to be so, or for which it seemed necessary to offer more or less of apology,[1]

The trial here suggested has never, to my knowledge, been seriously undertaken; and to execute successfully the attempt which Coleridge recommends would scarcely be possible to any one person, though ever so diligent an investigator.

Besides *conscious* and *strenuous*, not only the unregrettable *fatuate*, *furibund*, *glibbery*, *lubrical*, *magnificate*, *oblatrant*, *obstupefact*, *prorumped*, *turgidous*, and *ventosity*, but *barmy*, *chilblained*, *clumsy*, *damp*, *defunct*, *incubus*, *inflate*, *puffy*, *reciprocal*, and *retrograde* are derided, by Ben Jonson, in *The Poetaster*.

Touching Shakespeare's alleged dislike of *accommodation*, Mr. De Quincey falls into the same error with Coleridge, of whom he is, not unfrequently, little more than an echo. See his *Works* (ed. 1863), Vol. 5, p. 51.

Accommodated is the word which Shallow takes out of Bardolph's mouth, and harps upon; and it is Bardolph's misuse of it, not his using it, that Shakespeare ridicules. Compare *Cymbeline*, Act 5, Scene 3.

Nor has Shakespeare any objection to *remuneration*. The manner in which Costard plays on it proves nothing. Compare *Troilus and Cressida*, Act 3, Scene 3.

In short, as to Coleridge, his memory not seldom played him false. One of the words which he adduces is touched on by Ben Jonson. "You are not to cast a ring for the perfumed terms of the time, as *accommodation*, *complement*, *spirit*, &c., but use them properly in their place, as others." *Timber*, *Perspicuitas*.

In the *Curiosities of Literature* (ed. 1866), Vol. 3, p. 25, we read, in a foot-note: "Shakespeare makes 'Ancient Pistol' use a new-coined Italian word, when he speaks of being 'better *accommodated*'; to the great delight of Justice Shallow, who exclaims: 'It comes from *accommodo*, a good phrase'."

Shallow, in searching for an etymology, would most naturally go, as he here seems to have gone, to the Latin. Nor is it certain that the Italian gave us *accommodate*. In *A World of Wonders*, from the French, published in 1607, the verb occurs at pp. 121, 216, 237, twice to translate *accommoder*.

[1] Among the words specified in the pages immediately following, there are some which, though now current, were, as is gathered from the comments evoked by them, once in abeyance, or, at all events, are found stated, or intimated to have been so.

it is curious to observe how many of them have gained a permanent place in our language. Of such, to the extent of several hundred, with the comments suggested by them, scattered over our literature, I have prepared a collection. Perhaps a few excerpts from it will not be unacceptable.

The time was when our homely *gown* was so novel a name as to invite denunciation.[1]

Sir Thomas Elyot, writing in 1531, terms the word *maturity*[2] "straunge and darke"; *industry* he calls "straung"; he speaks of *modesty* as "not beeing knowen in the Englysh tongue"; and of *magnanimity*, as "beeing yet straunge, as late borowed out of the Latine".[3]

---

[1] "The Commons were besotted in excess of apparel, in wide surcoats reaching to their loyns; some, in a garment reaching to their heels, close before, and strowling out on the sides, so that, on the back, they make men seem women; and this they call by a ridiculous name, *gown*." *Camden's Remains*, &c., pp. 252, 253.

Gown, it thus seems, was the name of a man's garment, before it was the name of a woman's.

A manuscript work, entitled *Eulogium*, referred to the time of Edward III., is here professedly quoted. If in English, not only its spelling, but its language, must, of course, have been modernized.

Barnabe Riche was distressed at *piccadilly*, both the name and the thing. "But he that, some fortie or fifty yeares sithens, should have asked after a *pickadilly*, I wonder who could have understood him, or could have told him what a *pickadilly* had beene, either fish or flesh". *The Honestie of This Age* (1614), pp. 37, 38 (ed. 1844).

Did Riche suppose that the staider articles of apparel had come down, with their names, from before the Flood?

[2] Except where a word remarked on is part of a sentence, I exhibit it in its present form.

[3] *The Governour* (ed. 1580), fol. 71, 73, 78, 173.

In fol. 78, *mansuetude* is spoken of as "beeing, semblablye, before this time unknowen in our tongue". Puttenham uses it.

From a remark in fol. 201, it appears that *intellectus* had not yet become *intellect*.

"Sir Thomas Elyot, writing in 1534, speaks of the now familiar

In the same year, it was deemed necessary to gloss, as being archaisms, the substantives *behest, chieftain, desert, thralls, thraldom.*[1]

According to Richarde Willes, *despicable, destructive, homicide, imbibed, obsequious, ponderous, portentous,* and *prodigious* were novelties in 1577.[2]

---

words *frugality, temperance, sobriety,* and *magnanimity,* as being then not in general use in England." *The Westminster Review,* Vol. 14 (1831), p. 86.

Elyot's own criticisms on these terms I am unable to give.

Frugality I find in Udall's *Apophthegmes* (1542), fol. 90.

[1] The equivalents given are *promise, captain, wilderness, bondmen, bondage.* See *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 94. It is words in *The Praier and Complaynte of the Ploweman unto Christe* that are there explained.

At p. 98 of the volume just referred to, *heryinge* is glossed by "worship, praise."

Hieron, in *The Preacher's Plea,* the Dedication to which is dated 1604, writes: "It may seeme superfluous to draw the people to *hearing* upon the weeke-dayes, when men are otherwise in their worldly affaires to bee employed." *Works* (ed. 1624), Vol. 1, p. 539.

"I have learned since, that he . . . . has a mother, between seventy and eighty, who walks, every Sunday, eight miles to *hearing,* as they call it, and back again." Cowper, *Works,* Vol. 7, pp. 37, 38.

In Cowper's time, *hear* was still largely used, by some people, for 'attend divine service', especially for the purpose of listening to the sermon. See *The Literary Churchman,* 1868, p. 494. May it not be that the *hearing* in question was, originally, *heryinge? Hery,* 'worship', was not too old for Spenser.

[2] Willes, in *The History of Travayle,* &c., *Preface unto the Reader, ad finem,* here glances at what he looks upon as pedantries in Richarde Eden. "Many of his Englyshe woordes", he says, "cannot be excused, in my opinion, for smellyng to much of the Latine." Instead of the terms which he criticizes, Willes tells us he would have *low, noisome, manslaughter, drunken, dutiful, weighty, wonderful,* and *monstrous.* Among unnaturalized words used by Eden, Willes objects to *antiques, ditionaries, dominators, solicitate,* the substitutes proposed for which are *ancient* (sic), *subjects, lords, careful. Dominator* is used by Puttenham.

Willes, at the end of his "Preface unto the Reader", gives us an idea who, in 1577, were accounted preeminently good writers of English:

Sir Philip Sidney, who died in 1586, using the word *diction*, prefixes to it the parenthesis "as I may tearme it."[1]

George Puttenham, under the date of 1589,[2] notes, as neoteric, *compendious, declination, delineation, dimension, figurative, function, harmonical, idiom,*[3] *impression, indignity, inveigle, method, methodical, metrical, numerous, obscure, penetrable, penetrate, placation, prolix, refining, savage, scientific,*[4] *significative,* &c. &c.[5]

"I have not, for every worde, asked counsayle
Of eloquent Eliot, or Sir Thomas Moore [*sic*].
Take it, therefore, as I have intended:
The faultes, with favour, may soone be amended."

Willes's edition of Eden's work was on my book-shelves; but I did not know what was to be found there about words, until I happened to be turning over the *Curiosities of Literature*.

Sir John Harington, in *A Briefe Apologie of Poetrie*, &c., prefixed to his translation of the *Orlando Furioso* (1591), says that the Earl of Surrey and Sir Thomas Wyatt "are yet called the first refiners of the English tong".

[1] An *Apologie for Poetrie* (ed. 1868), p. 68. *Diction* is used only once by Shakespeare; and it is where he makes Hamlet reply to Osric in an affected style of phraseology which has come, most unjustly, to be called euphuism.

Donne, in his *Polydoron* (1631), p. 62, has "*diction*, or word".

[2] *The Arte of English Poesie*, pp. 121—123.

[3] "Ye finde also this word *idiome*, taken from the Greekes, yet serving aptly, when a man wanteth to expresse so much, unles it be in two words, which surplussage to avoide, we are allowed to draw in other words single and asmuch significative."

At p. 120, Puttenham tells us that he intends, by *idiom*, "mother-speach". At p. 86, he writes of the place where a "sharpe accent falls, in our owne *ydiome*, most aptly and naturally".

Gabriell Harvey, before Puttenham, namely, in 1580, had used *idiome*, and in the sense it now bears. *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 281. He was followed, in the time of James I., by Edmund Bolton, in his *Hypercritica*. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 252.

[4] This is the first of his own strange terms which Puttenham enumerates.

[5] *[Note in the next page.]*

Taking revenge on Thomas Nash, Gabriell Harvey taxes him with having forged "a misshapen rabblement of absurd and ridiculous words, the proper bodges of his new-fangled figure, called *foolrisme*"; and he instances *sacrilegiously contaminated, humour unconversable, interfuse, disputative, hermaphrodite phrases, declamatory styles,* and *censorial moralizers.*[1] This was in 1593.

In *The Knave of Clubbs,*[2] by Samuel Rowlands,

Of *politien.* [*sic*] he writes: "This word, also, is received from the Frenchmen, but, at this day, usuall in Court, and with all good secretaries: and cannot finde an English word to match him; for, to have said a man *politique* had not bene so wel, bicause, in trueth, that had bene no more than to have said a civil person. *Politien* is rather 'a surveyour of civilitie' than 'civil', & a 'publique minister or counseller in the State'".

[5] As *assubtiling* and *numerosity.* Puttenham adds: "But peradventure (& I could bring a reason for it) many other like words, borrowed out of the Latin and French, were not so well to be allowed by us; as these words: *audacious,* for 'bold'; *facunditie,* for 'eloquence'; *egregious,* for 'great' or 'notable'; *implete,* for 'replenished'; *attemptat,* for 'attempt'; *compatible,* for 'agreeable in nature', and many more."

Puttenham being critically choice in his diction, it is interesting to see what terms used by him are now obsolete. Among them are the substantives *abusion, ambage, applausion, bain, braggery, confessal, disacquaintance, epithalamy, fistule, hayward, heathenness, implicative, mansuetude, mercedes, numerosity, otiation, passement, podestate, rejoicement, remiss, rere-banquet, scoffery, siecle, viciosity;* the adjectives *confuse, importune, inconcussible, leisurable, liminous, odorable, slipper, terminant, uplandish;* the verbs *acknow, appassionate, disgrade, exornate, foregrow, meeken, propone, tobeslick, tranlace;* the adverbs *apertly, brimly;* and the preposition *behither.*

[1] *Pierce's Supererogation,* pp. 178, 179 (in *Archaica,* Vol. 2). Harvey also specifies *dromidote ergonist.* The grief of Harvey was natural, at being pelted with so mysterious a missile as this epithet.

[2] This is the first part of *The Four Knaves.* The verses quoted are from the edition of 1844, p. 29.

published in 1600, "Signieur Worde-monger, the Ape of Eloquence," is made to say :[1]

"As on the way I itenerated [*sic*],
A rurall person I obviated,
Interrogating times transitation,
And of the passage demonstration.
My apprehension did, ingenious, scan
That he was meerely a simplitian.
So, when I saw he was extravagant,
Unto the obscure vulgar consonant,
I bad him vanish most promiscuously,
And not contaminate my company."[2]

---

[1] Verstegan writes: "I wil not cloy the reader with .... the repeating of such lyke discourses as hee used, that told, how, as hee itinerated, hee obviated a rurall person, and, interrogating him concerning the transitation of the tyme, and the demonstration of the passage, found him a meer simplician; whereas, yf, in his true speech, he has asked him what was the clock, and which had bin his way, his ignorance might of the simplician have bin enformed in both." *A Restitution*, &c., pp. 205, 206.

The date of this is 1605. Verstegan must, therefore, have taken it from the first edition of *The Knave of Clubbs* (1600).

[2] The majority of the words here grouped together for ridicule have, I need scarcely say,—the pedantic or Latinistic use of them being laid aside,—since become good English.

It is curious to observe how long *promiscuously* has been abused in one way or other. Richard Franck wrote, in 1658: "But we relinquish these pleasant streams of Errit, to patrole the fields of Cooper, in Angus, where Scotland's great General (the Earl of Leven) was born *promiscuously* of obscure parents." Also: "The day, as prenoted, *promiscuous* and gloomy." *Northern Memoirs* (ed. 1694), pp. 129, 147.

Simplician is used by several writers, as in *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 6, p. 2; and by Heylin, in *A Full Relation*, &c. (1656), p. 40. *Humanitian* occurs in Chettle, *Kindhart's Dreame* (1592), p. 33 (ed. 1841): Gabriell Harvey, *Pierce's Supererogation* (1593), p. 148 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 2): Heylin, *Examen Historicum* (1659), Part 1, p. 129. *Naturian*. William Watson, *A Decacordon*,

If we may believe Verstegan,[1] *equip* was quite unintelligible, at least in "the north partes", "not many yeares past".

In *A World of Wonders*,[2] 1607, *turbant*, an old spelling of *turban*, is found marginally explained by *tolibante*.

King James's revisers of the Bible, in avoiding *holocausts*, *prepuce*,[3] *rational*,[4] and *tunic*, pique themselves, as we learn from their Preface, on having "shunned the obscuritie of the Papists."[5]

Mabbe, in his admirable translation of Aleman's romance, explains, in the margin, *mosquito*[6] and *mulata*.[7]

&c. (1602), pp. 341, 358. *Omniscian.* Gabriell Harvey, *Pierce's Supererogation*, p. 186. *Theaterian.* Dekker, *Satiro-mastix* (1602), sig. I 3 v. Still worse, as to etymology, is *hungarian*, for 'a hungry person'. See Dekker, *A Knights Conjuring* (1607), p. 31 (ed. 1842): Samuel Rowlands, *The Four Knaves*, p. 110.

[1] See a story in his *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, p. 205.

[2] P. 235. Also see p. 317, where the spellings are *turbante* and *tolibant*, the latter of which is also Puttenham's spelling, while Nash, in his *Lenten Stuffe* (1598), has *turbanto*. At p. 239, *tetrastich* is explained to mean "a quatrain or staffe of foure verses."

[3] "Castalion's *avant-peau* is as absurd, in French, as the Remists' *prepuce* is, in English." *A World of Wonders*, p. 77, marginal note.

[4] Dr. Timothy Puller, in his *Moderation of the Church of England*, &c. (1679), Chapter 4, omits this word, and very disingenuously, as the reader will see, if he looks into the matter. *Azymes* and *pasche* complete the list of the Bible-revisers.

[5] Dr. Heylin, in his *Observations*, &c. (1656), p. 3., remarking on the phraseology of the Romish English Bible, enumerates, as among its "words utterly unknown to any English reader, unlesse well-grounded and instructed in the learned languages": *acquisition, adulterate, advent, condign, dominical, evacuate, host, loaves, neophyte, paraclete, prevaricator, presence, proposition, repropitiate, resuscitate, sabbatism, victims.* I shall not stop to comment on this list.

[6] "Lat. *culex*, 'a gnat,' which the Spaniards call by the name of *mosquito*." *The Rogue* (ed. 1623), Part 1, p. 233.

[7] "*Mulata is* a maid-child that is borne of a negra and a fayre man,

Dr. Peter Heylin, writing in 1625,[1] by joining to *infantry* the apologetic words "as the martialists term it," intimates that the expression was not yet in common use. Agreeably to the same author: "*Plunder*, both name and thing, was unknown in England till the beginning of the war; and the war began not till September, Anno 1642".[2]

Philemon Holland, having used *little nephew*,[3] to denote the kinship of Cyrus to Astyages, has the side-note: "Or *grandchild*, as some will have it."[4]

---

and so on the contrary. And, because it is an extraordinary mixture, they compare such a one to a mule." *Ibid.*, Part 2, p. 328. *Negra*, for 'negress', occurs again in Part 2, p. 261.

Our present unetymological *mulatto* was long in getting settled. "The rich *molotto* lady, I presume?" *Hurlothrumbo* (1729), Act 2.

[1] *A Full Relation*, &c. (1656), p. 261.

[2] *Examen Historicum* (1659), Part 1, p. 248. To this statement Fuller offers a slight amendment, in asserting, that "the name *plunder*" began, in England, "some months, the practise thereof, some weeks, before our war." *The Appeal of Injured Innocence*, &c. (1659), Part 3, p. 50.

[3] By his *little nephew*, an expression elsewhere unknown to me, Holland seems to imply, that *nephew*, in its present acceptation, was coming into use. But, if *nephew* was to be allowed its new sense, *little nephew*, as significative of a relation different from *nephew*, ought to mean 'nephew's child'.

[4] *Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 7. At p. 115, Holland has *nephewes*, with the marginal annotation: "Children's children,—as we say unproperly, *grandchildren*."

At p. 178, *miriades* is explained by "ten thousands." Holland might be quoted largely for information as to what words used by him were novelties. Among his inventions is *otacusts*, p. 118, interpreted, in the margin, by "privy escouts." He must have been of a sanguine temperament, if he supposed that posterity would consent to Anglicize *ὠτακουστής*.

Holland, if read, especially in his final work, for philological ends, might easily mislead. He was forty-nine years old when, in 1600, he published his translation of Livy; and he put his last hand to his *Cyrupædia* in 1629. His manner of writing never changed; and,

Milton,[1] under the date of 1649, calls *demagogues* "this goblin word".

Seven years later, Heylin, named just above, compiled "An Alphabetical Table,[2] containing the Un-

---

while he proposed new words without end, he rejected, in his language, almost nothing that he found established. Even in Sir Thomas More there is little which he thought so far antiquated as to be given up; and herein he was markedly peculiar.

[1] *Eikonoklastes*, Chapter 4. Milton here refers to a passage in the *Eikon Basilike*, Chapter 4: "Who were the chief *demagogues* and patrones of tumults," &c.

[2] It is given at the end of *Observations*, &c. (1656). I pass by the words which Heylin taxes his author with using in new senses; and, of those which he calls "uncouth and unusuall", I by no means transcribe all, in the catalogue which follows. *Abstruse, acquiesce, adequate, adoption, adventitious, alleviate, amphibious, animadvert, antagonist, asperse, causality, chirography, clancular, commensurate, compensate, complacence, complicate, concede, concrete, confraternity, culpability, depredation, despondence, desponding, destination, dual, embryo, emerge, emergent, emolument, equilibrate, eradicate, erudition, evacuate, excogitate, excoriate, exuberancy, fortuitously, germinate, gestation, gust, hectic, hibernal, holocaust, horizontal, hypothesis, identity, imminent, impede, impetuously, impurity, inaudible, inauspicious, incantation, incuriosity, incurious, individuation, inflame, inhume, initiation, inorganical, inquietude, intense, interfere, intersect, intrinsic, irritate, iteration, luminary, luxuriancy, magnetic, meliorate, mercurialist, metamorphosis, minatory, mode, morass, narrator, nave, nonsense, noxiousness, nude, oblique, occult, ocular, odium, offertory, omen, onerous, operate, opine, organical, pact, placable, ponderous, portentous, precarious, preponderate, prevarication, radiant, rancidity, reciprocate, reduction, refulgent, relax, repertory, respond, retention, reverberation, salubrious, scheme, scintillation, sedulous, series, sterile, stimulate, stipulate, stricture, superfetation, supinely, susceptible, symbol, synopsis, system, temerity, temporalities, tendency, terrene, treatment, trepidation, unison, vacuity, valediction, veniality, veteran, vigil, virile.*

Charged with having employed "many lofty words," L'Estrange replied: "As to those lofty words, I declare to all the world this not uningenuous acknowledgement, that, having conversed with authors of the noblest and cheif remarque in several languages, not onely their notions, but their very words, especially being of the most elegant import, became, at length, so familiar with me, as, when I apply'd my self to that present work, I found it very difficult to renounce my

couth and Unusuall Words which are found" in Hamon L'Estrange's *Reign of King Charles*, the first

former acquaintance with them; but, as they freely offred themselves, so I entertain'd them, upon these considerations." *The Observator Observed* (1656), p. 2.

The Preface to the second edition of *The Reign of King Charles* opens with this sentence: "What oblique descants will come traverse upon this honest narrative, I already prejudicate."

At p. 21 of the work, L'Estrange writes, with reference to Lord Keeper Williams: "For, when once the publique is put into our clientele, under our protection, all by-relations must stand aloof. Nor was his mischief great, his cancelier; his fall being onely from the first loft: for, though he parted from the Great Seal, he kept the lawn-sleeves; and, though he left the purse behind him, he went away with the money, having feathered his nest pretty well: and, apprehending his condition to be somewhat tottering, he made all the means he could to reingratiate himself with the Duke; but nothing could prevail; nor would the Duke be exorated, no, not by the intercession of the Countesse, his mother: but it was not enough to pluck his feathers, unlesse his nails were pared, also."

L'Estrange tried, but in vain, to convict Heylin of having misunderstood the meaning of the Latin *stylus*; and it is no wonder that the divine, while defending himself, was tempted into parodying the historian's pedantry and grandiloquence. "Now the thunder-thumping Jove transfund his dotes into the pericranium of our learned author, who seems, like Rhombus, in Sir Philip, ... to be even gravidated with child, untill he hath endoctrinated our plumbeous cerebrosities in the adæquate sence and perceptibility of the word," &c. *Extraneus Vapulans* (1656), pp. 37, 38.

Archdeacon Todd injudiciously subscribes to Vernon's judgment, that Heylin "so wrote as to be comprehended by the most vulgar reader." My own conclusion, after reading several thousand pages of his writings, is, that he was scarcely less fond of hard words than the victim of his criticism. Whether any given expression was allowable, or unallowable, he would not, however, grant that any one but himself was a proper arbiter. As I could easily evince, many of L'Estrange's terms which he reckons "uncouth and unusuall", had been in good use for half a century, or more, before they were placed in the glossary epitomized in this note.

Heylin, though now pretty thoroughly forgotten, was, in his day, a man of mark. A stauncher or more learned son the Church of England can hardly name between Hooker and Waterland. For voluminousness I know of no writer, during the whole of the seven-

edition of which very affected and tasteless effusion had then recently been published.

"There is a new word coined, within few months, called *fanatics*," writes Thomas Fuller,[1] in 1660.

Bentley,[2] in his answer to Boyle, says: "The words in my book which he excepts against are

---

teenth century, that surpasses him. Unweariable, fearless, spirited, logical, of boundless information, and a master in his way of communicating it, there is much in him that challenges admiration. The servile character of his loyalty he shared with all other monarchists of his time; and, in estimating him, it can easily be made too much of. As to his pugnacity, also, it was, to be sure, somewhat in excess; but there was nothing ill-natured about it; and one reads with pleasure, that he and Fuller, for all the hard hitting they exchanged, subsequently not only made each other's acquaintance, but became fast friends, and so continued until they were separated by death.

[1] *Mixt Contemplations in Better Times*, Part 1, 50. Fuller did not object to it, however; for, in Part 1, 29, and again in Part 2, 45, he uses the term himself. And Henry More, in his *Mystery of Godliness* (1660), p. 517, has the substantive *fanatic*.

[2] *Works*, Vol. 1, Preface, p. liv. Bentley's writings have been but carelessly scanned by our lexicographers, who might have added, from them, the words, or forms of words, here following: the v.a. *cauponate;* the v.n. *pervene;* the substantives *cauponation, obel, pawawer, seazon;* and the adjectives *Calvinian, chorical, cismarine, cyclian, physiognomonical, psychomantic.*

Bentley may, further, be appealed to as warrant for several words which are known, to our dictionary-makers, only as of later date. Here are some of them, with their oldest recorded authorities attached. *Authenticate:* Warton. *Cauponate*, v.n.: *Bailey's Dictionary. Onerate: Bailey's Dictionary. Recension*, as now used: *Edinburgh Review.*

I do not contend, however, that the overpassed words given above, and in similar lists in this volume, ought, all of them, to be inserted in a dictionary; and yet, in consistency with the plan on which dictionaries have hitherto been compiled, not one of them should be omitted. Nor am I so rash as to imagine that I have, here or anywhere else, discovered absolutely the earliest use of any word. As to *authenticate*, for instance, I have proof that it was used in 1612, and again in 1617; but I dare say it had often been in print before.

commentitious,[1] *repudiate*,[2] *concede*,[3] *aliene*,[4] *vernacular*,[5] *timid*, *negoce*, *putid*, and *idiom*[6]; every one of which

[1] *Commentitious* is used by Sir Arthur Gorges, Translation of Bacon's *De Sapientia Veterum* (ed. 1619), p. 142: by Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία (1652), pp. 45, 236, with the adverb at pp. 236, 252, &c.: Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), p. 112.

[2] "Yet, when she understood how he was abjected and *repudiated* in the French Court, it could not choose but be a great agony and amazement unto her." Thomas Gainsford, *The History of Perkin Warbeck*, &c. (1618), in *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park, 1810), Vol. 6, p. 556.

Still older quotations will be seen in Dr. Richardson's *Dictionary*.

[3] "That the imbarque and stay of our ships at Blay, by Lewes his command, was an infringement of the league, it is *conceded*", &c. Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (ed. 1656), p. 58.

[4] Now written *alien*. For the substantive, see Bentley's *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 365; for the adjective, Vol. 1, p. 360, and Vol. 3, p. 227.

[5] Addison, in *The Spectator*, No. 165, adopts Bentley's *vernacular idiom*, but with some appearance of misgiving. Gibbon, in his *Memoirs of my Life and Writings*, speaks of "*repudiating* (as Dr. Bentley would say) my *vernacular idiom*." Colman, in *The Gentleman*, No. 3, and Cowper, in the Preface to his *Iliad*, employ the phrase *vernacular idiom*, and without thinking it necessary to excuse themselves for so doing.

"There are two expressions of frequent occurrence, equally wrong: 'incorrect *orthography*' and 'vernacular *idiom*'." Landor, *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 103.

But, surely, 'vernacular *idiom*' is quite unobjectionable, if we take its *idiom* in the proper sense of the term.

Vernacular is one of the words,—along with *benevolence*, *cuticle*, *flagitious*, *patriotic*, *primeval*, &c. &c.,—by which, as being equally out of the common with their French originals, Sir Thomas Urquhart, in 1653, represented the far-fetched jargon of Rabelais's Limousin student.

Invernacular is used by E. Jones, in *Cicero's Brutus*, &c. (1776), p. 198.

[6] If Boyle had been more explicit in his objection to this word, Bentley might have found it difficult to defend himself. Vagueness he seems to have thought fairly answerable by evasion. Boyle himself, in his *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations . . . . Examined* (1698), which called forth the defence quoted above, had used *idiom*, at pp. 42, 43, 67, 68, in the sense which it bore with his contemporaries, and which

were [*sic*] in print before I used them, and, most of them, before I was born [1662]." He adds: "But the Examiner might have remembered, before he talked thus at large, who it was that distinguished his style with *ignore*[1] and *recognosce*,[2] and other words of that sort, which nobody has yet thought fit to follow him in."[3]

---

it still bears. Bentley—see his *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 355,—had made it synonymous with 'dialect'; as equivalent to which, or to 'language', it has since been employed by Lady Mary W. Montagu, Blackstone, Gibbon, and many others. Instead of *idiom*, as more accurately applied, Bentley has *idiotism*. Vol. 2, p. 70.

"And what is history without its *idiome*, truth, but a meer romance?" Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles*, Preface.

A nearer approach to modern usage is seen, where the same author writes, that "the priest . . according to the *idiome* of antiquity, alwaies imported none inferiour to the bishop." *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), p. 322.

"Well applyed, John Ellis, and, possibly, intelligible enough in a place of manufactures, but nothing proper to the true meaning of the word in the vulgar *idiome*." Heylin, *Extraneus Vapulans* (1656), p. 279.

See, further, Bishop Sprat, *The History of the Royal Society*, &c. (ed. 1667), p. 42.

Richard Franck writes, affectedly enough, of "the *idiom* or form of a horn." *Northern Memoirs* (ed. 1694), p. 177. This work was composed in 1658. Also *vide supra*, p. 109, note 3.

[1] In its acceptation now obsolete, 'be ignorant of.' I find an instance of it in Burthogge, *Causa Dei* (1675), p. 25.

The legal sense of *ignore*, which, since Burke showed it to the public, has gradually become popularized, I do not know to be as old as the days of Boyle. Our present *ignore* is derived from *ignoramus*, an expression formerly employed by jurymen.

Bentley also instances Boyle's *cotemporary*, as objectionable. His own "*broaching* of expressions," which Boyle impugns, he does not even deign to defend.

[2] When Boyle wrote, *recognize*—except in the sense of 'revise,'—may still have been regarded as somewhat Gallic; and for this reason, probably, he went back, in his affectation of classicism, to the Latin, in choosing *recognosce*.

[3] *In the conclusion* of this sentence, Bentley alludes to Boyle's pro-

Jeremy Collier, criticizing the expression "wafting air", remarks, that *wafting* "is almost worn out of use";[1] and he blames Congreve for qualifying 'roof' and 'knowledge' as *ample*.[2]

Addison notes *profile* as being "a French term of art";[3] *relief*, in its application to a picture, he treats as if still foreign;[4] and he speaks of "what the painters call a *grouppe*".[5] Milton's *cornice, culmin-*

---

phecy: "Sir William Temple may say *sufficiency*, and the world will speak after him." *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations . . . . Examined*, p. 287.

Audibly, at all events, the world has not herein chosen to "speak after" Sir William Temple, who would impose on us the word *sufficiency*, in the sense of 'self-sufficiency'. Boyle delivers himself as if he thought *sufficiency*, whatever its meaning, a neoterism. If not, then, grossly careless, he was grossly ignorant.

I should mention, that Bishop Lowth, for one, has taken up with Temple's sense of *sufficiency*. "In the mean time, God administers and dispenses the several evils of this life by different measures, and in various ways, as best may answer his wise, his righteous, his good and merciful designs: to humble us; to check our pride and *sufficiency*;" &c. &c. *Sermons and Other Remains* (1834), p. 188.

"Lowth was well aware of his own excellence on this point [*viz.*, as a writer of English]. Alluding, one day, to Mr. John Lind, who had defended the conduct of Lord North, in an admirable pamphlet on the American War, he observed: 'No man can write better English than Lind, *except myself*'." *Ibid.*, p. 25, foot-note.

Yet the Bishop could call Solomon's Proverbs "the most curious and valuable *remain* of antient wisdom". *Ibid.*, p. 109. Was this ever really English? See, besides the Dictionaries, Sir John Hawkins, for "our little *remaine* of victuals", in Hakluyt, Vol. 1 (1589), p. 556; and Oliver Cromwell (1651), in Mr. H. Cary's *Memorials*, &c. (1842), Vol. 2, p. 380.

And could the Bishop have defended his verb *disculpate*, his substantive *expectative*, and such a spelling as *substraction*? See *The Life of William of Wykeham* (ed. 1759), pp. 161, 38, 86.

Elsewhere, the Bishop thinks good to write *cucumer, ferriery, hist*, and *reap-hook*, for *cucumber, farriery, hiss*, and *reaping-hook*. *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Notes, pp. 9, 52, 51, 127.

[1] *A Short View*, &c. (ed. 1730), p. 218. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 254.

[3] *Dialogues upon the Usefulness of Ancient Medals*, Dialogue 3.

[4] *Ibid.* [5] Note on *The Story of Phaeton*.

ate, *equator*, and *zenith* are, in his opinion, too technical for ordinary apprehension.[1] Further, on his credit, *cartel*, *commandant*, *corps*, *defile*, *gasconade*, *marauding*, *pontoon*, and *reconnoitre* were scarcely English in 1711.[2]

A year earlier, Swift[3] ridiculed *alert*[4] and *banter*, and spoke of *ambassador*, *battalion*, *circumvallation*, *palisado*, and *preliminary*, as if he supposed they were not likely long to survive what he took to be their then recent birth.[5]

Richardson, in *Clarissa Harlowe*,[6] makes one of his

---

[1] *The Spectator*, No. 297.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 165. "Half the French words used affectedly by Melantha, in Dryden's *Marriage à-la-Mode*, as innovations in our language, are now in common use. *Naïveté*, *foible*, *chagrin*, *grimace*, *embarras*, *double entendre*, *equivoque*, *éclaircissement*, *ridicule*,—all these words, which she learns by heart, to use occasionally, are now in common use." Isaac Disraeli, *Curiosities of Literature*, *History of New Words*.

[3] *The Tatler*, No. 230.

[4] Though Addison seems to regard *alertness* as good English, he writes *alerte*,—see *The Spectator*, No. 403,—as if he considered the word to be French still.

[5] That Swift could take even the greater part of these terms to be absolutely novel is inconsistent with his having been much of a reader, or, at least, with his having had a good memory.

"Your young gallants of the time . . at best talk of nothing but *rampards* and *parapats*, *musquetads*, *estramaçons*, and *canonads*." Richard Fleckno, *A Relation of Ten Years Travells*, &c. (1655), pp. 11, 12.

This list, antedating Swift's by more than half a century, is curious, if intended to register words which, when Fleckno wrote, were emerging, or threatening to emerge, into popularity.

Rampire, in 1655, would not have attracted notice: though now poetical, it is older than *rampart*. *Parapet* is in many a book anterior to Fleckno's time. *Cannonade*, the substantive, is not noticed by Dr. Johnson, or by his editor, Archdeacon Todd.

[6] Vol. 6, p. 223 (ed. 1811). But, even in the time of Richardson, *the word was on* the point of achieving something of respectability.

characters say: "When I have least to *narrate*,—to speak in the Scottish phrase,—I am most diverting."

Dr. Johnson[1] charges Dr. Blackwell with using, in *attainder*, *outlook*, and *parapet*, "words that every other polite writer has avoided and despised."[2] *Arrangements* and *reconnoitred*[3] he treats as if they

---

I note some instances of its occurrence prior to its being acknowledged as good English. R. O. Cambridge, *The World* (1754), No. 56. Garrick (1769), *Private Correspondence*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 344. Miss Burney (1782), *Cecilia*, Book 9, Ch. 2, and Book 10, Ch. 10. William Taylor, *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 16 (1795), p. 514: *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 4 (1797), p. 335: *The Annual Review*, Vol. 1 (1803), p. 256. William Godwin, *The Enquirer* (1797), p. 470. Coleridge (1800), *Essays on His Own Times*, p. 377. Charles Lamb (1802), *Letters* (ed. 1837), Vol. 1, p. 215. Southey, *The Annual Review*, Vol. 2 (1804), p. 17.

In *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 4 (1813), p. 433, we read of "the abominable verb *narrate*, which must absolutely be proscribed in all good writing." Eight years later, this "abominable verb" was used in the same work, by Southey. See Vol. 24 (1821), p. 463; also Vol. 57 (1836), p. 2. And Southey had used it long before, as I have shown just above.

It occurs in *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, and not as a quotation, p. 67 (ed. 1693). At least twenty-five years earlier, Bishop Lloyd recognized it as English. See, under *signifie*, his Dictionary appended to *An Essay towards a Real Character*, &c., by Bishop Wilkins (1668).

[1] In his review of *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus*.

[2] Had Dr. Johnson read all other polite writers? And, even if he had, could he rationally believe that he remembered they had, to a man, avoided any particular word or words? As he himself and other lexicographers have shown, the three expressions which he here despises had received highly respectable sanction long before his day.

[3] Aaron Hill wrote, in 1743: "A writer polished into the modern embellishments would have taken this opportunity to shew his erudition in French, by the word *reconnoitre*. Horrible affectation of jargon! Such abominable insertions as this phrase, and *tapis*, and *éclaircissement*, and all the frightful et cætera most in fashion, into a language they rather stick to than unite with, seem to me as ridiculous an endeavour as an Act for Naturalization of Blackamoors." *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 224.

were not yet domesticated.[1] *Jeopard*, *suite*, and *womanhood* he declares to be "obsolete"; *jeopardy*, to be "not now in use"; *succumb*, to be "not in use, except among the Scotch"; and *proceeds*, the substantive, to be "not an imitable word." *Smouldering*, he says, "seems a participle; but I know not whether the verb *smoulder*[2] be in use."[3] In 1771, his opinion was, that "*feeling*, for 'tenderness', or 'sensibility', is a word merely colloquial, of late introduction."[4] He also writes: "Wagers are laid, in the city, about our success, which is yet, as the French call it, *problematical*."[5]

Miss Carter, having occasion, in 1754, to use the word *kinswoman*, remarks on it, as being "old-fashioned."[6]

Writing in 1761, Dr. Priestley says:[7] "We do not call a female author an *authoress*; and, if a lady

---

Reconnoitre was used, by Graves, as late as 1772, in the original sense of *reconnaître*, 'recognize.' "He would hardly have *reconnoitred* Wildgoose, however, in his short hair and present uncouth appearance." *The Spiritual Quixote* (ed. 1820), Vol. 1, p. 150.

Five years before, Horace Walpole wrote: "So incompetent has the generality of historians been for the province they have undertaken, that it is almost a question whether, if the dead of past ages could revive, they would be able to *reconnoitre* the events of their own times, as transmitted to us by ignorance and misrepresentation." *Historic Doubts*, &c., Preface, p. 1.

[1] See *The Idler*, No. 8.

[2] Dr. Richardson finds it in Sir Thomas More, Holinshed, and Bishop Jewell. For *smoulder*, as a verb active, see Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Image of Governance* (1544), fol. 25 v.

[3] See Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary*, first edition.

[4] *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 446.

[5] Letter to Mrs. Thrale, Nov. 1, 1777. Boyle and Swift must, then, have Gallicized. See the Doctor's *Dictionary*.

[6] *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c. (ed. 1809), Vol. 2, p. 158.

[7] *The Rudiments of English Grammar*, &c., p. 53.

write poems, she is, now-a-days, called a *poet*, rather than a *poetess*, which is almost obsolete."

Wording, in 1762, was considered, by John Wilkes, to be a vulgarism.[1]

Strange as it may seem, Gray,[2] in 1771, regarded *eschew*, *forth*, *gaud*, *meed*, *sheen*, *in sooth*, and *wight*, as "obsolete." The adjective *infuriate* he thought was coined by Dr. Beattie.[3]

---

[1] See *The North Briton*, No. 17.

[2] *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 309. Gray refers especially to the diction of poetry. He adds *aye*, *fand*, and *ween*.

[3] *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 311. Almost incredibly, Gray believed Dryden to have minted the verbs *disherit*, *furbish*, *smoulder*, *villanize*; the substantives *array*, *beldam*, *beverage*, *crone*, *disarray*, *knar*, *mood*, *roundelay*, *trim*; and the adjectives *doddered*, *retchless*, *wayward*. *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 153. This was in 1742. But Gray, to the very last, held views, as to the vocabulary of our language, such as no heedful or wide-read student of English literature could possibly entertain. Even the Bible would have shown him *array* and *furbish*; Chaucer, *crone*; Spenser, *disarray*, *disherit*, *mood*, and *roundelay*; and Shakespeare, *beldam*, *beverage*, *trim*, and *wayward*. As to *villanize*, we read, in *A World of Wonders* (1607), p. 203: "Because the curtizan had angered him, he would revenge himselfe upon God, and so despite and *villanize* him as neither Turke nor Jew could have done worse."

Gray's finicalness about expressions was excessive. For instance, he writes: "I rejoice to find you *apply* (pardon the use of so odious a word) to the history of your own times." *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 84.

I am not aware that this use of *apply* ever was "odious". Instances of it prior to Gray's criticism are seen in De Foe, *Moll Flanders* (ed. 1840), p. 347; and in Richardson, *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1811), Vol. 2, p. 378.

"I have been too ill and too dispirited to *apply* to anything for some weeks past." Miss Carter (1769), *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 2, p. 60.

"Those who *apply* to the study of the common law often boast," &c. Bp. Hallifax (1779), *An Analysis of the Roman Civil Law* (ed. 1795), Preface, p. xvi.

"He mingled in cursory conversation with the same steadiness of attention as others *apply* to a lecture." Dr. Johnson, *Life of Savage*.

Also see Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote* (ed. 1820), Vol. 1, p. 114; Southey, *Letters*, &c. (1797), p. 9; *Cowper's Works*, Vol. 1, p. 11.

Dr. John Hoadly wrote, in 1773: "I . . . received them handsomely at half *past* seven, as the modern English now is."[1]

Sir Harry Hamper, in a play of Foote's which came out in 1776, asks, at Calais: "But is not there some danger? Won't their magistrates, their *policy*, as they call it here, take it amiss?"[2] The word *police*, at least in its present sense, could not have been common then in English.[3]

"I don't know whether I can assent to your criticism on the word *replete*, that it is never used in a good sense. Were it left to me, I would use it in no sense. It has but little meaning. It was never naturalized in conversation, or in prose, and, I think, makes no figure in verse." So wrote Bishop Shipley to Sir William Jones.[4]

"If I may compose such a word," adds Sir William, himself, to the word *heart-rending*.[5]

"The world itself is in a state of *superannuation*, if there be such a word," wrote William Cowper, in 1781.[6] The same year, he calls *unwell* "the Irish

---

In Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary*, even in the edition of Dr. Latham, the sense of *apply* here exemplified is overpassed.

[1] *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 571.

[2] *The Capuchin*, Act 3.

[3] Horace Walpole uses it in his *Historic Doubts*, &c. (1768), Preface, p. 8.

[4] *Memoirs . . . . of Sir William Jones* (ed. 1806), p. 204. The letter quoted is dated in 1781.

"The author of the English Commentary has a note on this passage, *replete* with fine taste and sound criticism." Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 114.

[5] *Memoirs . . . . of Sir William Jones*, p. 206. Waller had used *heart-rending*; but the term must have been unusual, when Sir William Jones wrote as above, in 1782.

[6] *Works (ed. Southey*, 1835—1837), Vol. 15, p. 65.

term" ;[1] and, in 1785, *taken in*, for 'duped,' was, with him,[2] a "jockey-phrase." To *beetling* he annexes this note: "The word has the authority of Shakespeare, and signifies 'overhanging'."[3] As to *rife*, he feels there is occasion to explain that it "is a Saxon word, and signifies 'frequent' or 'common'."[4]

A use of the word *ticket*, which has not yet risen above the level of slang, appears to have come up about 1782.[5]

Uvedale Price, in 1794, having used the term

---

[1] *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 161. No doubt, *unwell*, while still a novelty, affected the sensibilities of those who heard it, much as *ungood* affects our sensibilities.

Unwell has, almost of course, been classed as a "Yankeeism". Lord Chesterfield used it. And it was familiar to Miss Carter in 1761 and 1764. See her *Letters to Mrs. Montagu* (ed. 1817), Vol. 1, pp. 103, 213. But it was not unknown a whole century before their time. "A little *unwell*" occurs in Sir Thomas Urquhart's Translation of *Rabelais*,—Book 1, Chapter 6,—published in 1653.

Since I wrote thus much of this note, a remark made by my little boy of ten has induced me to extend it. On my casually speaking to him of some one as being *unwell*, he repeated the word, called it "strange", and added that he supposed I meant "not well." To say truth, in the vernacular language of England, *unwell* is not commonly employed, except between men, in the general sense of 'indisposed'. Women avoid it, unless talking among themselves; and then they use it, for the most part, euphemistically.

[2] *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 134. Edward Moore, in *The World*, No. 96 (1754), calls *take in* a "fashionable phrase". Richardson uses it in *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1811), Vol. 6, p. 398. Dr. Johnson calls it "a low vulgar phrase".

[3] *Odyssey*, Book 10.

[4] Note on *Paradise Lost*, Book 1, l. 650. *Rife* occurs in Gay's *Polly*, Act 3.

[5] The year Miss Burney published her *Cecilia*, where we read, in Book 1, Ch. 3 :

"'A *ticket ?*' repeated Cecilia. 'Does Lady Nyland only admit her company with *tickets ?*'

"'O Lord!' cried Miss Larolles, laughing immoderately. 'Don't

picturesqueness, attached to it this foot-note: "I have ventured to make use of this word,—which, I believe, does not occur in any writer,—from what appeared to me the necessity of having some one word to oppose to beauty and sublimity, in a work where they are so often compared." [1] It would strike us as strange, if any one should now think an apology needed for tacking *-ness* to an established adjective, the result involving neither undue length nor harshness. Price risks *unpicturesque*; but its substantive was beyond his daring.

Mrs. Godwin stigmatizes "a villain *in grain*" as "a significant vulgarism." [2]

On the word of William Taylor, *livelong*, in 1797, was "growing obsolete." [3] The next year, Taylor wrote, in what must, at that time, have been accounted most outlandish phraseology:

"Were we endeavouring to characterize this work, in the dialect peculiar to Professor Kant, we should observe, that its *intensive*, like its *extensive*, magnitude is small; as a detached disquisition, or as a contribution to the theory of taste, it is alike unimportant; its *subjective* is as slight as its *objective*, worth. Of the author we cannot but suspect, that his *empirical* acquaintance with works of taste is not comprehensive; his *receptivity* for *æsthetic* [4] gratifi-

---

you know what I mean? Why, a *ticket* is only a visiting-card with a name upon it; but we all call them *tickets* now'."

[1] *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., p. 38.

[2] *Posthumous Works* (1798), Vol. 4, p. 49.

[3] *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 23, p. 175.

[4] As knowing this term, and as never shrinking from anything unusual in diction, it is unaccountable that Taylor should write: "Lady Russell's letters have rather a moral and political, than a *beautiful* value." *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 75 (1814), p. 155.

Much in the same way, Addison, in his *Travels*, &c., *Brescia*, *Verona*,

cation, not delicate; his *transcendental* deduction of the categories of criticism, neither *discretive* nor *exhaustive;* and that the *phenomena* of beauty, with respect to him, rank among the *noumena.*"[1]

The reader will not require to be told how many of the terms here got together for their oddness would now elicit no remark even from a purist.

In 1799,[2] a critic expressed the wish that a certain author "had not disfigured his pages with the French words "*fracas, route,* and *trait.*[3]

Padua, tells of "*apoplectic* balsam". Cowper has "*ludicrous talent*", in the sense of 'talent for the ludicrous'. *Works,* Vol. 7, p. 327. And I have more than once read of "a *miscellaneous* author." Yet some of our accepted idioms must once have seemed quite as odd. We have *sick rooms* and *dying beds.* We qualify an *asylum* as *insane,* and we have not only *houses* that are *mad,* but *doctors* and *nurses,* with others who, for all their hearing and talking like other folks, are *deaf and dumb.*

[1] *The Monthly Review,* Vol. 25, p. 585.

[2] *Ibid.,* Vol. 28, p. 56. Mr. John Pytches would have omitted these words from the dictionary which he began, but unfortunately left a fragment. He adds *apropos, bizarre, canaille, cap-a-pie, hauteur.* See *The Monthly Magazine,* Vol. 21 (1806), p. 386.

[3] To most Americans it will, I suppose, be news, that these words, and so the substantive *invalid,* still have, with Englishmen, their French pronunciation.

Gray names together, as French words, *advertisement, éclaircissement, éclat, ennui, fracas, hautgout, raillery,* and *ridicule. Works,* Vol. 5, p. 299.

Some of these words, as *advertisement, raillery,* and *ridicule,* were pretty well established long before Gray's time; and some of them are, to this hour, essentially French.

Hautgout was, once, anything but uncommon in literature and in speech, and was often written *hogo* and *hogoe.*

It was *hogo,* I surmise, that suggested the vulgar *fogo.* At first, probably, *fogo* was added to *hogo,* for the sake of jingle; and then, as the word, from resemblance to *faugh, foh,* intrinsically conveyed the idea of disgust, *hogo fogo* was shortened to *fogo.* Again, in *holy fogo,* the *holy* may be a corruption of *hogo.*

The Rev. Jonathan Boucher[1] hastily specified, as new, in 1800, the words *berth*,[2] *cockroach*,[3] *grog*, *gully*, *leggings*, *molasses*,[4] and *smash*.

In the *Edinburgh Review* for 1809,[5] *crass*[6] is called "radically and entirely new, and as utterly foreign as if it[7] had been adopted from the Hebrew or Chinese"; and exception is taken to *millennial*[8] and *utilize*.[9]

---

[1] See *A Glossary*, &c., Introduction, pp. xlix. and l. The Introduction was not published till long after the author's death.

[2] It was used by De Foe, in 1720. See *Captain Singleton* (ed. 1840), p. 176. Three instances of it are seen in *The Jealous Wife*, by Colman (1761). Also see Miss Burney, *Evelina* (ed. 1779), Vol. 1, Ch. 16: Thomas Dibdin, *The Birthday*, Act 1, Scene 2: Robert Jephson, *Two Strings to your Bow*, Act 1, Scene 3.

[3] Its etymology our lexicographers do not even attempt to trace. Without question, it is from the Portuguese *caroucha*, 'chafer', 'beetle', and was introduced into our language by sailors.

[4] This was a term of rather rare occurrence, it seems, prior to about the middle of the last century. The old form of the word is exhibited in the "Widow *Molosses*" of Murphy's *Upholsterer*, 1758.

The very marked distinction between *molasses* and *treacle* is commonly ignored in America, where the latter is seldom heard of under that name.

[5] Vol. 15, pp. 28, 29.

[6] Among their authorities for *crass*, the Dictionaries quote Edward Halle, Bishop Taylor, Cudworth, and Sir Thomas Browne; and I find, in Henry More, *crass*, *crassly*, *crassitude*, and *crassness*. To the Scotch critic, with his proverbial "small Latin", very likely even the *crassa ignorantia* and *crassa æquitas* of the lawyers were "as utterly foreign as .... Hebrew or Chinese."

[7] The original has "are"; *brumal* being coupled with *crass*. But *brumal* is used by Sir T. Herbert and Sir Thomas Browne, as Dr. Johnson and Archdeacon Todd acquaint us. Also see *The Naturall and Experimentall History of Winds*, &c. (1653), p. 3; and Thomas Taylor, *Pausanias* (1794), Vol. 2, pp. 320, 321. As might have been expected, the critic knew nothing of Martial's *brumalis*; and he cannot have heard of the French *brumal*.

[8] Burnet has been cited for this word; and I might adduce, for it, the author of *The Life of Joseph Mede*, Henry More (*passim*), and Jeremy Collier. Dr. Richardson does not know any such adjective.

[9] *Utilize*, a word both useful and readily intelligible, was very slow *in becoming naturalized*.

"It is beyond all doubt, that he was sometimes thus imposed upon, or, to use a word which seems now to be naturalized, thus *mystified*." So wrote Southey,[1] in 1816; and, in 1826: "The students were friends and *chums*, a word so nearly obsolete, that it may be proper, perhaps, to explain it, as meaning 'chamber-fellows.'"[2]

Under the date of 1818, Archdeacon Todd[3] says that *grade* "has been brought forward in some modern pamphlets"; and he rashly risks the prophecy, that "it will hardly be adopted."

Lord Macaulay[4] finically objects to *saturation*, as "not pure English." Probably he would have found no fault with *saturity*, which, however, to most people, is no English at all, pure or impure.[5]

Utiliser is found in Dupré's *Lexicographia Neologica Gallica*, published in 1801. M. Laveaux calls it, in 1822, "mot nouveau qui commence à prendre faveur." *Dictionnaire Raisonné des Difficultés . . . . de la Langue Française*, Vol. 2, p. 602. "Son admission dans le Dictionnaire date de 1835." M. Francis Wey, *Remarques*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 81.

As lately as 1855, M. Viennet railed at his countrymen for using the verbs *utiliser*, *activer*, and *formuler*. M. Génin has well replied: "J'avoue que je ne vois pas bien où est la crime. Ces mots sont clairs, marqués *præsente nota*, puisque nous avons *utile*, *actif* et *formule*; ils n'ont point d'équivalent en français: pourquoi donc les repousser?" *Récréations Philologiques* (ed. 1858), Vol. 1, p. 26.

[1] *Essays Moral and Political*, Vol. 1, pp. 261, 262.

[2] *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, p. 502.

[3] In his first edition of Johnson's *Dictionary*.

[4] *Miscellaneous Writings* (London ed., 1860), Vol. 1, p. 331.

[5] We should be wretchedly straitened, if one might not introduce such a word as *saturation*. *Saturatio* is used by St. Augustine; and it differed, to him, from *saturitas*, just as *fillingness* would differ from *filledness*. Analogous to these words are *maturatio* and *maturitas*, both which belong to the golden age of Latin.

Saturity, for 'saturatingness', would be ambiguous. Conversely, so would *preparation* be, for 'preparedness'. The latter, as precluding

The substantive *conservative* he called,[1] in 1832, "the new cant word." "*Puffed* with wonderful skill" he introduces with the half-apology, "to use the modern phrase";[2] and that, though he had put the verb, and without prochronism, into the mouth of Osborne,[3] the bookseller knocked down by Dr. Johnson.

Mr. De Quincey, in 1832, writes of "the two supporters, or *andirons*,—as they were formerly called."[4] It must seem strange to an American, to find *andirons* spoken of as a word grown antiquated.

Fabulous, for 'incredible',—a sense of the word which, by the by, Lord Macaulay has countenanced,[5]—is, with Mr. De Quincey, a "modern slang phrase";[6] and so is the substantive *pervert*.[7] Does

equivocalness, Lord Macaulay has not scrupled to employ. And, in so doing, he did well. But why was he to have the monopoly of eschewing riddles?

[1] *Miscellaneous Writings*, Vol. 2, p. 78.

[2] *Id.*, Vol. 2, p. 281.

[3] *Id.*, Vol. 2, p. 270. Mr. J. C. Hotten shows, in *The Slang Dictionary*, that it must have been common in 1732.

[4] *Klosterheim*, p. 247.

[5] "He found that the waste of the servants' hall was almost *fabulous*." *Miscellaneous Writings*, Vol. 2, p. 372.

[6] *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 234, foot-note.

[7] *Id.*, Vol. 11, p. 95, foot-note.

In Vol. 1, p. 73, Mr. De Quincey uses *fixture*; but, in Vol. 5, p. 139, he seems to hesitate about its propriety. Coleridge, I think, somewhere excuses himself for accepting this irregular successor of our forefathers' *fixure*. He writes *fixures*, in his *Church and State* (ed. 1839), p. 404. He could, however, write *fixtures* in 1812. See *Omniana*, Vol. 2, p. 17; or *Literary Remains* (1836), Vol. 1, p. 329.

Mr. De Quincey also writes: "Cant words ought, certainly, to be proscribed, as degrading to the majesty of religion. The word *prayerful*, for instance, so commonly used of late years, seems objectionable." *Works, Vol. 11, p.* 206.

his own "played H— and Tommy"[1] belong to a loftier atmosphere?

"When, some twenty years ago," writes Archbishop Trench,[2] "an '*Educational* Magazine' was

---

That is here assumed which ought first to have been proved. Many a pious person, if denied *prayerful* and *prayerfully*, would feel, and would rightly feel, himself or herself to be grievously robbed and wronged. Richard Baxter has *prayerful;* and it is no blemish to the elegant pages of my revered teacher, Professor Longfellow.

[1] "Many a wild fellow in Rome ..... would not have played 'H— and Tommy' in the way they did." *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 250. "And, about a hundred years earlier, Lord Bacon played 'H— and Tommy'," &c. *Id.*, Vol. 9, p. 135, foot-note.

[2] *English, Past and Present* (ed. 1859), pp. 77, 78. In *The Literary Churchman* for 1856, p. 93, *educational* is sneered at as "unscholastic". Two pages after, it is used in an original review-article!

William Taylor used this adjective in 1810; and he had been anticipated by Burke. It was in print, however, long before Burke's time.

"What, then, would the Holy Ghost here teach us, but that the *educationall* and professionall are to be imputed and accounted for nationall, sinnes?" John Gaule, Πυς-μαντία (1652), p. 30.

Many a word is circumstanced like *educational*, regarding which it would be vain to inquire whether Burke, or whoever first brought it forward in the last century, was aware that it had been used before. It is not unsupposable that a word may be proposed independently by a dozen different writers, and, after all, from not being a desideratum, may fail of being popularly accepted. To pass to ascertained facts, there actually are words which were ventured many generations ago, but, for some reason or other, were not taken up, became altogether or generally forgotten, and yet are now familiar to everybody. In such cases, we have not resuscitations, but virtually new inventions. Among the words specified below, two or three fall strictly under this description.

Abandonment. Nash, *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem* (1594), p. 165 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 1); *Lenten Stuffe* (1599), in *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 146. Dr. Johnson gives *abandonment*, but without an illustrative extract. Our ancestors long expressed its sense by *dereliction*. The verb *abandon* was, in 1631, classed, by Henry Cockeram, among words "now out of use, and only used of some ancient writers."

started, the first impression on one's mind was, that a work having to do with education should not thus

---

Ancestorial is not a word peculiar to this century, as, on the showing of the lexicographers, it seems to be. It was used in 1659. See *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 88. Also see Dr. Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 192. Sydney Smith has *ancestorially*, the adverb. *Works* (one-vol. ed., 1850), p. 417.

Appetize is treated, in the Dictionaries, as if Sir Walter Scott may have introduced it into literature. It is found in Urquhart's Translation of *Rabelais* (ed. 1694), Book 2, p. 196.

Ash, the singular of *ashes*, is not recognized by Dr. Webster's editors, except as part of a compound. Archdeacon Todd wrote, in 1818: "We say, in colloquial language, 'burnt to an *ash*'." And this had long been home-English, as it is still. Even Dr. Donne speaks of the *ash* of tobacco. *Polydoron* (1631), p. 142.

Atrabilious, which has supplanted *atrabilarious*, was first registered by Dr. Worcester. I find it in Hallam, Southey, Mr. Carlyle, &c. But it was used in 1664, by R. White, in his Translation of *A Late Discourse*, &c., p. 94.

Authenticate. Thomas James, *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture*, &c. (1612), Part 3, p. 10: Francis Cottington (1617), *Gul. Camdeni et Illust. Vir. ad G. C. Epist.*, p. 192: Bentley (1716), *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 518. As a Latinistic participial adjective, the word occurs in Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), p. 52. The verb *authenticate* was unknown to Dr. Johnson. It is used by several of his contemporaries, as Burke, Horace Walpole, &c.

Commentation. Edmund Bolton, *Hypercritica* (1616), in *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 233. Gaule, *Πῦς-μαντία* (1652), pp. 127, 358. *The Naturall and Experimentall History of Winds*, &c. (1653), pp. 76, 111. In our own time, it has been used by Dr. Whewell, Mr. Isaac Taylor, the Rev. Charles Kingsley, &c. &c.

Denunciate. This verb, which Burke uses, is found in Nash, *Christ's Tears*, &c., p. 47.

Devilry is not the modernism which Dr. Latham represents it as being. See, for the word, Stubbes, *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1585), pp. 145, 170, 215 (ed. 1836). Dr. Richardson quotes, for it, Sir Thomas More and Prynne.

Experiential is credited, by the lexicographers, to none but very modern writers, as Dr. Whewell. But Coleridge had anticipated him. *Experientially* is used by Henry More, *Philosophicall Poems* (ed. 1647), *Preface to Psychozoia.*

bear upon its front an offensive, or, to say the best, a very dubious, novelty in the English language."

Heathenry was neglected, until Dr. Worcester discovered it in *The North British Review*. It is used by Stubbes (1585), *ut supra*, p. 162.

Humiliate. In *Christ's Tears*, &c., p. 76, Nash has this verb active, —for which Dr. Richardson gives a still earlier authority;—and so has Camden, in his *Remains* (ed. 1674), p. 328. Horace Walpole used it in 1760. *Humiliating* has the sanction of Blackstone. Archdeacon Todd defines *humile* by "humiliate", which, however, he forgets to record in its place. Dr. Latham knows no verb *humiliate;* and Dr. Richardson exemplifies the word as an adjective only.

Infamize is found in *The Life . . . of Father Paul* (ed. 1676), p. 74. Dr. Worcester first mentions it, and as used by Coleridge. *Infamizer* is one of Nash's words which Gabriell Harvey held up for ridicule, in 1593. See *Pierce's Supererogation*, p. 179.

Norm is credited, by Dr. Worcester, to Coleridge. See, for it, James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), p. 169: Brathwait, *The Lives of all The Roman Emperors* (1636), p. 375.

Novelet, in the sense of 'small new book', is met with in Gabriell Harvey, *Four Letters*, &c. (1592), p. 37 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 2). *Novel*, of which it is a diminutive, is used, by Harvey, in *A New Letter*, &c. (1593), pp. 4, 10 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 2).

Patrial. Gaule, Πῦϛ-μαντία, p. 301. William Taylor, *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 23 (1797), p. 484; *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 9 (1800), p. 6; *The Annual Review*, Vol. 4 (1806), p. 237.

Premit, for 'premise', appears in Dr. Donne's *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), Preface, sig. E 1 v. The only authority for it which the Dictionaries mention is Hutcheson.

Qualitative. Gaule, Πῦϛ-μαντία, p. 49.

Row, for 'disturbance', was spoken of, by Archdeacon Todd, in 1818, as "a very low expression"; and he quotes Douce as saying that it "was very much used a few years since." Spranger Barry used it in 1746. See *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 41.

Sconce, the verb, meaning 'fine', "appears to be modern", Dr. Richardson says. Dr. Johnson knew of no authority for it; and Archdeacon Todd quotes *The Idler*. Milton used it in 1641. See his *Prose Works* (ed. Bohn), Vol. 2, p. 416.

Senesehalship was first disinterred by Dr. Worcester, and from the pages of Sir Walter Scott. I find it in *The French Academie*, Part 1 (ed. 1589), p. 561.

Well, and what is the matter with *educational*? Utility, perspicuity, and conciseness are, we all know, to persons of a certain sort,—those who would keep the world in leading-strings,—nothing, if to be purchased at the cost of innovation. The people who would object to *educational* are, however, of the same type, and, almost invariably, of the same class, with those who, if they were but honest enough and manly enough to speak out their convictions, would object to everything that is connected with the word, in our associations. For, inconsistent as the majority of men are, we every day observe, more and more, that, as those who seriously favour progress at all favour it in all things, so those who openly resist it in one direction would, in propitious circumstances, resist it in all directions.

Illustrations like the preceding might be largely multiplied; and, indeed, there are, in my third chapter, many quotations which, though there brought forward for a special purpose, would none the less be in place here.

Tout and *touter* are found in no Dictionaries but those of very recent date. Yet these words were in use before 1754. S. Richardson, *Correspondence*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 316.

Tribal was first recorded by Dr. Richardson, and as used by Bp. Warburton. It occurs in Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse*, &c. (1632), p. 296.

CHAPTER V.

NEOTERISM.

Novis in rebus licet nova nobis verba confingere.

SOUTHEY, in a letter to William Taylor,[1] protests, with much emphasis, against his addiction to words "which are so foreign as not to be even in Johnson's farrago of a dictionary." "Do sometimes ask yourself the question," he again urges,[2] "whether the word you are about to use be in the dictionary, or not." This was in 1803 and 1804; and, already then, Southey would have found himself cruelly tortured, if adjusted to the Procrustean bed which he recommended to his friend. Sixty or seventy years ago, our dictionaries were, to be sure, a trifle worse than they are now; but one may well marvel, that a man of letters, whether in 1804 or in 1873, should remit a fellow-craftsman to an English dictionary, as determining what is permissible in phraseology, and what is otherwise. Most people, however, after they have learned to spell, keep books of this class mainly for show, the end they best fulfil. Lexicographers apart, it is only a curious inquirer, here and there, that appreciates intelligently their deplorable vanity and delusiveness.[3]

---

[1] Mr. Robberd's *Memoir of William Taylor*, Vol. 1, p. 452.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 488.

[3] Johnson's *Dictionary*, in particular, though a great advance on its predecessors, has been ludicrously overrated. Quite possibly, there

Boldness of pretension is, notoriously, the surest and the safest of means for gaining acceptance with the multitude. And no less undeniable is it, that, of all claimants to consideration and authority, the maker of a book, provided it is not a poem or a novel, is the most generally taken at his implied self-assessment; as if his intrinsic credit were best ascertained by his own valuation of it. The few write and lead, and the many read and follow; and the many, exaggerating the difference of care and conscientiousness which obtains between what is merely spoken and what is formally set before the world, assume that statements deliberately made in print, and, as it were, under hand and seal, must needs have secure foundation. A statement so made becomes, when once lodged in the memory, an article of stable mental furniture; and it is not easily dislodged by a counter-statement, however solidly substantiated. Indeed, oftentimes it is not even perceived that the original assertion is contradicted, unless the contradiction is professedly and pointedly propounded as such; and this, if not pressed with vehement earnestness, is unlikely to gain even a fugitive attention. Moreover, there is, in the majority of men, a pride which resents the very idea that their first impressions may stand in need of revisal. Mere chance of

---

are still those who believe, with a critic of the last century, that Johnson "has collected every word, good or bad, that was ever used by any English writer." Dr. Witherspoon, *Works* (ed. 1802), Vol. 4, p. 472. English literature proper being taken to date from A.D. 1250, if Dr. Johnson has recorded even a tithe of its vocabulary,—both words and senses being intended by this expression,—he has done *incredibly well.*

circumstances is their infallible determinator of the true and the false; and, somehow, it cannot but be that their old mumpsimus is preferable to any new sumpsimus.[1] It was not their choice that an alternative was not offered to them in the first instance: but there is a fault somewhere; and, as it cannot lie in themselves, it must, of necessity, lie in the tardy and intrusive competitor for their credence. By prejudices, fallacies, and confused reasonings, such as these, truth is stifled, error is propagated, and, especially where the indolence and the ignorance of a generation or two have authenticated their claims, bookwrights the most untrustworthy grow, in popular opinion, into authorities all but irrecusable. And with their sins of omission it fares much the same as with their sins of commission. Point out, be it ever

---

[1] When using *mumpsimus* and *sumpsimus*, I have so often been asked, in conversation, what I alluded to, that, perhaps, the following quotation, to some of my readers, may not be superfluous. "Quidam indoctus sacrificus Anglus per annos triginta *mumpsimus* legere solitus est loco *sumpsimus*; et, quum moneretur a docto, ut errorem emendaret, respondit, se nolle mutare suum antiquum *mumpsimus* ipsius novo *sumpsimus*." So—as quoted by Mr. Dyce—writes Sir Richard Pace, in his *De Fructu qui ex Doctrina Percipitur* (Basil, 1517), p. 80. Camden, in his *Remains*, tells the story in English, in his usual lifeless way. Heylin, in *The History of . . . . St. George of Cappadocia* (1631), p. 11, speaks of "those self-conceited ones which are so stiffe —as King Harry used to say,—in their new *sumpsimus*," &c.; and, again, in the *General Preface* to his *Ecclesia Vindicata* (1657), of "a vainglorious affectation of adhering to their old *mumpsimus*, as King Harry used to say." Was Heylin unaware of the origin of the saying? Or did the old loyalist think that a jest is not duly accredited, until patronized by a great man? Also see Heylin's *A Full Relation*, &c. (1656), p. 413, and *Examen Historicum* (1659), Part 1, p. 146.

Sir Thomas Elyot alludes to the anecdote quoted above. See *The Governour* (1531), fol. 173 (ed. 1580). Bentley, too, was acquainted with it.

so conclusively, that they have passed by, unnoticed, matters which demanded record, yet their silence shall have as many champions as their discourse. No doubt they were men of research; they were bound to sift and to cull; and they must have been governed, in what they did, by reasons which, though not proclaimed, may be presumed to be unanswerable. The entertainment of these sophistries and suppositions, which are none the less persuasive for seldom finding a voice, can alone account for the profound confidence which is still reposed in certain English lexicographers and grammarians.

The lexicographer and the grammarian are tied, primarily, to functions for the most part purely historical. Like any one else, they have a perfect right to speculate, over and beyond registering facts; but they have no right to do as, at variance with all the rest of the world, they so often do, and that is, palm off their own whims and theories, as if the net result of the most approved usage. Cockeram, for instance, ordains, in the name of elegance, that babblers *deblaterate*, that naughty children should be *depalmated*, that bread and buns are *pistated*, and that *biers* are to be superseded by *sandapiles*. Cobbett[1] teaches

[1] *A Grammar of the English Language*, Section 108. I have given only specimens of Cobbett's barbarisms.

"The mere understanding is careless about history, having set up certain abstractions in its stead: ignorance, too, is careless about history. The mere understanding seeks after uniformity, strips off the distinctions of things, and tries to bring them, as far as possible, within the range of a single generalization: ignorance, too, delights in that simplicity which saves it the trouble of thought. The combined influence of these two agents may be seen in Cobbett's *Grammar*; for, *in him, they* coexist in the very highest degree. Nothing can be

that we should pronounce and write *blowed, bursted, casted, clinged, drawed, freezed, growed, meaned, slinged, splitted, springed, stinged, strided, sweeped, swimmed, swinged, throwed, thrusted, weared, weeped.*[1] Dr. Webster, in his more unreasonable days, was pleased to prescribe *bawble, clew, fether, fiber, gayly, luster, meager, melasses, somber, specter, theater, traveler, savior,*

---

clearer and shrewder than that *Grammar*, so far as his Herculean understanding can supply the want of intellectual discipline, and of philosophical and philological knowledge. But, from his ignorance of other languages, and of the history of his own,—an ignorance on which, of course, he prides himself,—he is frequently wrong, and here, as in other matters, is thorough-going in his mistakes. That Cobbett, as uniting the two elements of the jacobinical spirit in such perfection, should be averse to what our grammarians call irregular verbs, and should be desirous of setting up one invariable form, a kind of ten-pound franchise, without any regard to the difference of circumstances, for all verbs without exception, was naturally to be expected; and, accordingly, he draws up a long schedule A of irregular verbs to be summarily got rid of." Archdeacon Hare, in *The Philological Museum*, Vol. 1 (1832), pp. 660, 661.

[1] Dr. Johnson's ruling, in his *Grammar*, as to the preterites and past participles of certain verbs, is peculiar. *Beseeched, catched, raught* (for *reached*), and *teached* he allows as preterites; *abid, rise, smit, thrive, writ*, &c. &c., as both preterites and past participles; *arose, bore, chose, drove, forsook, rode, rose, strove, took, wore*, &c. &c., as past participles. *Sitten*, without alternative, he gives as the past participle of *sit*. Did he ever venture to write it? But his liberality, also, should be exemplified. Regarding *shear*, for instance, he is very accommodating, in that he gives us a choice from among *share, shore*, and *sheared*, as its preterite, and between *shore* and *sheared*, as its past participle.

By the way, *shore*, as the preterite of *shear*, Dr. Webster's editors call "obsolete", though they find it used by Mr. Tennyson. I should be rather surprised to hear anything but *shore*, in England. High and low alike use it there. I give some references for it, old and recent. John Norden, *A Sinfull Mans Solace* (1585), fol. 66 v. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), p. 212. Cowper, *Iliad*, Book 23, l. 172: *Odyssey*, Book 24, l. 51. Lord Lytton, *What will he do with it?* (ed. 1859), Vol. 3, p. 323.

and a host of other personalities,[1] with scores of pronunciations as outlandish as *ăncient, ăngel, bedĭzen, dĕaf, prĭmer,* and the utterly un-English *zee,*[2] as the last letter of the alphabet; and his countrymen have been so foolish as to adopt whole categories of his vagaries.

In precisely the same way, Dr. Latham, in what he is pleased to call *his* Dictionary,[3] lately published,

[1] Every reader of old English literature knows that very few of these spellings are novelties. But, in the present day, they are, to a large extent, Americanisms.

All the world, I take it, has, for a generation or more, laid the stress on the antepenult of *inimical;* and yet Mr. B. H. Smart, in his third edition of *Walker's Dictionary*, p. xii., note 80, says, of Dr. Webster, for sanctioning this pronunciation, that he "sets at defiance the longs and shorts of Eton and Oxford, (if he knows anything of them), and, in all such cases, with republican contumacy, follows the uneducated tendencies of English speech."

This stuff about "republican contumacy" and its deplorable concomitants was, doubtless, grateful to Mr. Smart's aristocratic patrons, to whom facts were little or nothing, so long as Americans were well reviled.

The great mistake made by Dr. Webster, his spelling apart, consisted in his assuming that the pronunciation of the best educated Americans of his day was the true standard for the rest of their fellow-citizens: and that pronunciation deviated from the English, by a considerable heritage of archaisms and Scotticisms.

On the inexpedience of two standards of our language, one for each side of the Atlantic, I may touch at some other time.

[2] Of *z* Dr. Webster says: "It is pronounced *zee.*" So he has taught Americans to call it; but this fact did not warrant him in stating roundly what he knew to be, with regard to all Britons, totally false.

Dr. Webster's editors mark the word *zed*, on their own authority, as "obsolete". This will seem strange to Englishmen, who never give *z* any other name. Are the aforesaid editors grossly ignorant? Or do they take up the position, that only the English current in America deserves to be regarded as proper English?

The abstraction of *z* Mr. De Quincey calls *zedity. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 243.

[3] *Archdeacon Todd* enlarged Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary* not a little, and

has, without giving a hint of their conventional orthography, foisted upon us *aile*, *alkohol*, *appall*, *awless*, *ax*, *benum*, *benegroe*, *binn*, and a great many more of his private and other peculiarities. Nor is this all, by any means, or the worst. Despite the warnings afforded by his numerous predecessors, and in defiance of the scholarship of our age, with its exaction of thoroughness as a test of literary workmanship, he has made his election to walk, in the main, in the old paths. So far as can be gathered from his pages, *abbey* may have been first used by Lord Macaulay; *ably*, by Sir Edward Creasy; and *adjectival*, by Dr. Latham himself: the attempt to define the antiquity of a word not falling within the scope of his otiose endeavours. Again, though it is a laudable principle to certify the existence of a term, by adducing an illustrative extract, there is no excuse, where such extracts are not at hand, for rejecting, after the manner of Dr. Latham in almost every page, words which, immediately on their being named, every one recognizes to be as current, among us, as the air we breathe.[1] It may

muddled it in about the same proportion, but, after all, professed to be only an editor. Dr. Latham takes the fruit of their combined labours, calls it a basis, makes some insignificant additions, and gives the result his own name.

[1] Not unusual are, omitted under *a*: *abbotship*, *abhor*, v.n., *ablaze*, *abolitionism*, *abortiveness*, *absenteeism*, *absolutist*, *abstainer*, *abstrusely*, *accelerator*, *accentuate*, *accordion*, *accountability*, *accountantship*, *acquirer*, *acreage*, *acrimoniously*, *acrobat*, *additive*, *adequacy*, *adequateness*, *adhesively*, *adipose*, *adjudicator*, *adjudicate*, v.n., *adopter*, *adorably*, *adorner*, *advisableness*, *affectedness*, *affectingly*, *aforethought*, *age*, v.n., *aggress*, *aggressively*, *aggressiveness*, *aimlessly*, *aimlessness*, *air-tight*, *algebraically*, *alienage*, *alight*, adj., *alleviator*, *alluringly*, *ambassadorship*, *amenableness*, *amiability*, *amorphous*, *analogous*, *angelically*, *anglomania*, *ank-*

be asked, too, whether *abnegate, absoluteness, abutment, acclaim, according as*[1] are rare; whether *acephalist, adnate, allision, altisonant, antipart, antiscript* are not rare; and whether *abetment* and *agnatic* are obsolete. The judgments hereon of Dr. Latham, and equally the bulk of his judgments, differ, it may safely be concluded, from those of every one who has qualified himself to sit in the court of English philology. To fill page after page with particulars of his shortcomings, under each of the heads glanced at above, would cost only a little time and a little search.[2] More than this, thousands upon thousands of words used by our old writers, and entered by other lexico-

---

let, annihilator, ante-meridian, ante-nuptial, ante-penult, anther, aoristic, aperient, sb., *appetize, apple-dumpling, applicant, appreciator, aquarium, archæological, assentient, assonance, assonantal, assuager, astraddle, attach*, v.n., *audibleness, aulic, avatar, average*, v.n.

Among these words, even such a purist as Lord Macaulay has used *adjudicate*, v.n., *aggressively, alienage, aimlessness, alleviator, ambassadorship, anglomania, appreciator, assonantal*, and *attach*, v.n.; and at least half the rest he would not, I suppose, have objected to using.

Further, we find *admeasurement*, but not *admeasure; amativeness*, but not *amative;* and the adverbs *alacriously, answerlessly, anticipatively, antiphrastically, aphoristically*, but not the adjectives which they presuppose. And why should *Arianism* be honoured with presentment, but not *Arminianism?* Why *Arabism*, but not *Americanism? All but* is omitted; and *adjutancy* has no sense assigned to it besides that of "assistance." But such strictures are endless.

Nevertheless, the judgment, touching Dr. Latham's *Dictionary*, of an English journal of high literary character is, that, "whatever room there may be for improvement on the side of antiquity, it is a most admirable repertory for all that regards the latest strides of the language." *The Guardian*, 1871, p. 1395.

[1] This, I believe, not only is, but always has been, more common than *accordingly as*.

[2] Fuller lists, from which those here given are abridged, will be found in two letters which I contributed to *The Reader*, Vol. 3 (1864), *pp. 683, 684; and Vol. 5* (1865), pp. 42, 43.

graphers, or by glossarists, are ignored by Dr. Latham; the neoterisms of the post-Johnsonian period are, to him, in great measure, as if they were not; and, in matters of etymology, he has scarcely emerged from the eighteenth century. Nor, if he has here been perstringed but gently, is it because he has merits which challenge tenderness to his defects. And such is the latest and most pretentious of our manufacturers of English dictionaries; a brood to which, at present, it is idle to resort, if we would know even the wealth of our language, as exhibited either by our forefathers or by our contemporaries.[1]

---

[1] Before taking leave of Dr. Latham's *Dictionary*,—of which I have here examined, and examined very superficially, but a minute portion,—I will quote and criticize, by way of specimen, two or three extracts.

"*Aristarchy. s.* Body of good men in power. *Rare.*

"The ground on which I would build his chief praise, to some of the *aristarchy* and sour censures of these days, requires, first, an apology.—*Harrington, Brief View of the Church of England*, p. 153."

This article is taken, in the block, from Archdeacon Todd's additions to Johnson; and the Archdeacon must have been slightly bemused, when he defined *aristarchy* as we have seen, offering, as its etymology, "ἄριστος, greatest, and ἀρχή, government." The allusion is to that type of rigid critics, the famous commentator Aristarchus. The word is formed from *Aristarch*, as the old *charactery* is formed from *character;* and it denotes what we might express by *aristarchism*. Archdeacon Todd's definition and etymology are substantially copied by Dr. Webster; while Dr. Webster's editors, satisfied with the old definition, derive the word from "Gr. ἀρίσταρχος, best-ruling, from ἄριστος, best, and ἄρχειν, to rule." Dr. Worcester, who, just before the word, has *aristarch* and *aristarchian*, and correctly defined, gives, with an approach to correctness, "a body of severe critics", as its signification, but most thoughtlessly etymologizes it by ἄριστος and ἀρχή.

On looking into Sir John Harington,—for so his name is spelled on his title-page,—I find: "Howbeit, the ground on which I would build his chiefe praise (to some of the *Aristarchy* and sowre censures of these daies) requires, first, an Apologie." *Aristarchy*, like all proper names, and adjectives therefrom, is italicized in Harington; and, by

Among proverbial sayings which, though half-falsehoods, pass for whole truths, is the one that

---

reference to the original, Dr. Latham might, possibly, have avoided a repetition of Archdeacon Todd's ludicrous and unscholarlike error.

"*Armlet. s.* Bracelet.

> And, when she takes thy hand, and doth seem kind,
> Doth search what rings and *armlets* she can find. *Donne.*
>
> Every nymph of the flood her tresses rending,
> Throws off her *armlet* of pearl in the main. *Dryden.*"

Johnson's two first, unillustrated, definitions are omitted: "1. A little arm; as, an *armlet* of the sea. 2. A piece of armour for the arm." The remaining definition is injudiciously reduced, as above, from "a bracelet for the arm". For, by a *bracelet*, when the word is unqualified, we understand an ornament worn on the wrist, or just above it. The ornaments worn, by orientals and others, much higher up than the wrist, are instinctively called, by English-speaking people, *armlets*, not *bracelets*. Phillip Stubbes wrote, in 1585, of "bracelettes, and *armelettes* of golde." *The Anatomie of Abuses* (ed. 1836), p. 75. And Dr. Newman writes, in his *Callista*, p. 39: "They glitter, from head to foot, with combs, brooches, necklaces, collars, earrings, *armlets*, bracelets, &c."

Further, Dr. Latham should not have left it unnoticed, that *armlet*, to denote anything but 'little arm', is an abnormal diminutive. But of such considerations he seems to take little heed.

Dr. Johnson defines the adjective *sexagenary* by "aged sixty years", but gives no extract for it. Archdeacon Todd alters this definition to "threescore", and quotes Lord Chesterfield's *Common Sense*: "*Sexagenary* fair ones, and upwards, whether they were handsome or not in the last century, ought, at least, in this, to reduce themselves to a decency and gravity of dress suited to their years." Dr. Latham simply reprints all this! I may add, that there is older authority than Lord Chesterfield, for *sexagenary*. See Glanvill, *Plus Ultra* (1668), p. 23. The word is there a substantive.

The substantive *summist*, omitted by Dr. Johnson, is given by Archdeacon Todd, who tells us it is "from *sum*", and defines it to be "one who forms an abridgement." It is observable that the first of his two quotations, which speaks of "*Summists* and Canonists", did not suggest the correct meaning of the term. Dr. Latham punctually reproduces the ignorant vagueness of the Archdeacon. And Dr. Richardson is in the same boat with them. The *summistæ* were Hugo de S. Victor, Thomas Aquinas, &c., for whom, and their writings, see Ducange. Subjoined are a few references for *summist*, which is not a

arrogates a presumption in favour of whatever is established.[1] To confute this universal proposition, it is enough merely to ask when it began to hold good. If the adage imported less of compliment to the sagacity of our predecessors, it would do much more of justice to that of their descendants. Wise as our predecessors were, why may not we be wiser? In what had they any advantage over us? Is not a small body of facts a less safe basis of induction than a large body of facts? Or has the faculty of turning accumulated experience to good account perished from off the earth? Neither of these two last questions would any one dare to answer in the negative. And yet, from indolence, issuing in selfishness and timidity,—in a word, thanks to the spirit of conservatism, which infects, more or less, all minds but the truly energetic, and hence enlightened and disinterested,—the anile aphorism still triumphs, solemnly devolving, from age to age, its loathsome spawn of shams and inveracities. With just apprehension of reason, the conservative comes to take his stand solely on the imagination. For, at transition, as

very unusual word in our old writers. Bishop Bale, *Select Works* (1849), p. 350. Dr. Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), Preface, sig. D 1, and pp. 229, 230: *Biathanatos* (first, undated, edition), p. 32. Gataker, *Of the Nature and Use of Lots* (ed. 1627), p. 251. Dr. Richardson quotes Bp. Bull for it,

Dwelling on particulars of the sort above instanced, I might go on for hundreds of pages. And I here speak literally within compass.

[1] Ever and anon we are reminded, in much the same spirit of exaggeration, that sincerity is always to be honoured; though, practically, our respect for it is confined to those with whose ways of thinking and acting we have something in common. To the thugs murder is a sort of high mass; but their piety has not even earned them a niche in any Dictionary of Religions.

necessitated by change, the imagination revolts, and, therefore, is prone to resist change immediately,—no matter how strongly it may be recommended by obvious expedience,—rather than try to deal with transition on philosophical principles, the bridge by which we pass, when we pass consciously, from the old to the new. Hence, spontaneity, conservatism unconfessedly teaches us, if it ever was to be trusted, is to be trusted no longer; and human nature is a thing to be repressed, not educed. And thus undivided allegiance to prescription and authority at last resolves itself into servile apery, the great motive to which is, far too often, the behoof of its inculcators, to the disservice and thraldom of their disciples. As regards everything else, so as regards language, the spirit of rigid conservatism operates as a principle of unalloyed evil and mischief. Here, however, just as elsewhere, happily it is far less acted on than preached; or the result would be to reduce us, for arrest and inertia of articulateness, to the standard of Caffraria or China. But, in presence of the appliances for thought, and the incentives to employ them, which are afforded by modern civilization, retrogression is simply impossible. Lingually, as well as otherwise, the English-speaking peoples cannot but press forward to better things than they now enjoy; and the language of our remote posterity may be as superior to our own, as our own is superior to that of Mandeville or Wicliffe.

Languages, like nations, have their stages of development, apparent stationariness, and decay; but, *so long as* a people advances in intellectual cultiva-

tion, its medium of expression is never observed to deteriorate in quality. In the interval which was measured by the accession of Queen Elizabeth and the death of Milton, a general mental activity concurred with a wide-spread conviction, that, poetry being left out of account, English of the old stamp was inadequate to the purposes of literature. With laudable intrepidity, the writers of that period helped themselves, and without stint, to new words from every available quarter. While a large share of what they ventured singly at last turned out to be ephemeral, a still larger share of what they ventured in common was promptly engrafted on the vulgar tongue.[1] The age of finical dilettantism and emas-

[1] For a considerable length of time, the Puritans were in no wise behind other English Christians, in point of profane and polite learning; and it must, therefore, have been from motives of humanitarian policy that they declined to swell the flood of classicism, genuine and spurious, with which their rivals, especially the clerics among them, inundated the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To any one conversant with the theological effusions of the Church of England in that age, the following pungent delineation, from the pen of a sturdy Puritan, will commend itself as not in the least overcharged; and the pedantry of the class of writers reflected on scarcely improved, from about 1580, for some ninety years.

"As for the strange manner of preaching which is in use in many places, both in the Universities and elsewhere, there is no man well affected but, if hee knoweth it, hee doth exceedingly pity it. One, as though the pulpit were but as a scaffold, in which he, like a Master of Defence, were to play his prizes, and to give testimony of his wit, playeth upon every word, and descanteth upon every letter in his text; and, as though the Scripture were but a rattle for children and fooles to make sport withall, he tosseth it hither and thither, and will not faile to offer it any violence, to frame it to an imagined conceit, and to draw it to an idle purpose. Another, as if his purpose were onely to amaze the vulgar, and to affright and astonish the multitude, mounteth aloft, and is all, in his great words and new-coyned phrases, more fit for some mimick or tragedian then a minister of the Gospell.

culate elegance, with its paralytic imitators of Temple and Addison, soon afterwards followed;[1] and this was succeeded by the era of galvanized sesquipedalism and sonorous cadences, inaugurated by Johnson, with his train of Hawkesworths, Cumberlands, and Parrs,—a brood of pygmies essaying to wield a weaver's beam. But elephantine graces and their awkward mimics maintained, as was fitting, but a brief-lived supremacy. Even in the days of Johnson, however, the English air was beginning to be redolent of freedom. Whether this portent of doomsday and perdition,—fructifying in the Ameri-

---

A third, to gaine the opinion of a profound mən, that looketh into matters of more depth then the common sort, rubbeth over the unsavory writings of some moath-eaten frier, and, by an uncoth fashion of teaching, together with a multitude of allegories and intricate distinctions, mazeth both himselfe and all those whose unhappy chance it is to be his hearers. A fourth, to be reputed a good linguist and a man of great reading, stuffeth his sermon with a legion of allegations, and enterlaceth it with many shreddings of Latine and Greeke; and, by that meanes, though his doctrine perhaps may bee profitable, yet he confoundeth the memory of the diligent and attentive hearer. Thus, while men, being sicke of the Pharisaicall disease, *Love the praise of men more then the praise of God*, and preferre the ostentation of their owne supposed learning before the edification of Gods Church, the people is brought either into such an amazednesse, as they thinke that anything may be made of the Scripture, or to such an unsetlednesse in judgement, as that they doe rather hunt after variety of teachers, for their strange manner of preaching, then seeke for sound instruction, for their owne better edifying." Samuel Hieron (1604), *The Preachers Plea* (ed. 1624).

The passage here quoted occurs in the first volume of Hieron's collected works, p. 533.

[1] Gray, writing in 1742, says that the English tongue "is too diffuse, and daily grows more and more enervate." *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 159.

He has not thus described the English of 1742 at all amiss. And very like it, with the addition of localisms and general slovenliness, is the English of most Americans at the present day.

can War of Independence and the French Revolution,—were owing to the inductive philosophy, to John Wilkes, to the spread of science, to the Devil, or to all together, toryism was at a loss to resolve: but there it was, past all gainsaying. Britain was, at last, effectively awaking from its long slumber of acquiescence in things established. Our very language shook off its nightmare, and once more breathed as if broad awake, and no longer under the palsying spell of hidebound custom.[1] Men of the

[1] Cowper, in his private letters, imposed no restraint upon himself, as regarded verbal coinages; and, in this respect, he differed nothing from the generality of his contemporaries. When addressing the world, he professed, however, strict conservatism in his phraseology; and his neoterisms we are, therefore, bound to receive as unpremeditated. In the preface to his *Iliad*, we read: "I have cautiously avoided all terms of new invention, with an abundance of which, persons of more ingenuity than judgment have not enriched our language, but incumbered it." Where archaic, he very rarely deviates, in his diction, from such familiar precedents as Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, and Pope. His archaism would, in a writer of the present day, be thought rather profuse. Yet not only words, and senses of words, recalled from the past, but many which are, presumably, personal to himself, are interspersed through his translation of Homer. Of what may be such I have made a list of no fewer than eighty which are unregistered by Dr. Webster's editors. Passing by the novelties of meaning, among the novel or unusual words, to name only a few, are *architraved*, *athletic*, sb., *cast-off*, sb., *cauldroned*, *cityward*, *columnal*, *crystalled*, *customed*, *desirables*, *drunkard*, adj., *handful*, adj., *helmeted*, *hovel*, v.n., *leftward*, adj., *misdeem*, v.a., *mythologize*, v.a., *overbubble*, v.a., *overpitch*, v.a., *phalanxed*, *propend*, v.a., *revulse*, v.a., *sepulture*, v.a., *spearmanship*, *tridental*, *tripart*, adj., *updart*, v.n., *upwent*, *yeanling*, adj., *youngling*, adj. Apart from the eighty words spoken of above, Cowper virtually reinvents, where he does not borrow, *acuminated*, *debark*, v.n., *glutinated*, *intellected*, *invigour*, v.a., *market*, v.a., *mendicate*, v.a., *pash*, v.a., *procumbent*, *resupine*, *sacrifical*, *saginated*, *shive*, *speech*, v.n., *unchild*, v.a., *upridge*, v.a., *uprun*, *upsend*, *upstart*, v.n., *upswarm*, v.n., &c. &c. A certain share of all the forementioned terms were, without much question, of the poet's own minting, and unconsciously so; and we have, in them, an interesting illustration of

most contrary modes of thinking, and resembling each other in nothing but their sound literary culture, unconsciously influenced by the spirit of the age, agreed in forswearing, as to the use of their mother-tongue, the supine parrotry which had formed so important an ingredient of their education.[1] And thus we are brought to the fathers of the English which now prevails,—a language rational, natural, copious, and expressive, for those who require nothing more, and, for such as aspire to philosophize, precise and comprehensive, at least far beyond all old-school precedents.

We live, then, in an age when purism is no longer a religion. And yet it behoves us to remember, that, if purism is ridiculous, neoterism, whether in words or in style, may easily become nauseating. "Propriety of thought and propriety of diction", says Lord Macaulay,[2] expanding Horace,[3] "are commonly found together. Obscurity and affectation are the two greatest faults of style. Obscurity of expression generally springs from confusion of ideas; and the same wish to dazzle at any cost, which produces affectation in the manner of a writer, is likely

---

the expansion of vocabulary which our language was beginning to undergo, at the hands of scholars, often quite unawares to themselves, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

[1] Between the time of Milton's death and the birth-day of free English, there were dozens of excellent writers, we all know, whose great aim was neither mere ease and elegance, nor formal grandiloquence. Still, that interval was, markedly, one of imitation; and the rabble of literators who peopled it framed their style, and tied down their phraseology, after certain models then exclusively in vogue.

[2] *Essay on Machiavelli.*

[3] "*Scribendi* recte sapere est et principium et fons."

to produce sophistry in his reasonings." The study after singularity of expression is, moreover, a weakness which soon betrays itself. Nor is this all. It fails of its end; and a disciplined taste recoils from fantasts and contortionists like Mr. Carlyle, Archbishop Trench, and Mr. Browning, with just the sort of feeling provoked by the antics of a clever buffoon. It seems, indeed, as if eccentrics of this cast must be constantly repeating to themselves, with Tragedio:

> "Me, for my novelty, let all adore;
> For, as I write, none ever wrote before." [1]

The real fertilizers of our language, so far as they have fertilized it consciously, have been actuated by motives of utility. Trammelled by the poverty of our vocabulary, they have honestly striven to enrich it; neither aiming to be applauded for their good services, nor deterred by the obloquy of purists. And our verbal poverty has, oftentimes, pressed most heavily on those precisely who had the fullest command of our verbal riches. William Taylor judiciously lays down, that "Neology ought not to be pursued for its own sake, but only when the extant terms of the language are defective, or not precise, and when a definite and convenient expression can thus be introduced in their stead." [2] "Unusual

---

[1] Fielding, *The Pleasures of the Town.*

[2] *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 100 (1823), p. 23. Elsewhere Taylor shrewdly observes, that "A new or an uncommon word always attracts notice to the phrase in which it occurs; and, hence, it is well placed in those sentences which merit the pause of attention, and will bear a leisurely examination." *Ibid.*, Vol. 106 (1825), p. 492.

Taylor's own coinages, patronized imports, and revivals, which

and new-coined words", says Coleridge,[1] "are, doubtless, an evil; but vagueness, confusion, and imperfect conveyance of our thoughts are a far greater." Not content with barely enunciating a grievance, Coleridge took practical steps to redress it; and his marvellous subtilty and power of analysis could never have been fully appreciated, had he shrunk from a phraseology unshackled by ordinary restrictions. Nevertheless, we are told, by Madame de Stael, that "il n'est point, en général, de symptome plus sûr de la sterilité des idées, que l'invention des mots."[2] It could, then, be nothing short of absolute

---

cannot amount to fewer than a thousand, dwindle, if tested by his laudable criteria, and by the exigencies of euphony, to a meagre list indeed. Most of them are normal, certainly; still, either because there were shorter and as regularly formed substitutes for them, or because they offended the ear, or for some other good reason, very few of them, if any, have been accepted. Here is a sample of some of the more extraordinary among them: *ancestrial, animability, anniverse, apartmental, attroopment, breadthen, condensity, congenerous, considerative, defial, detainal, dispiritude, empoisonment, epuration, evulgate, expunction, extenuatory, hazardy, hyperspermatic, imprejudice, interestability, juratory, magnitudinous, maritality, materteral, minutious, momentaneity, monocrat, monopolous, moratory, neologous, nerterology, obtainal, onymous, orbation, physiocrat, purgate, retainal, rivalrous, satellitious, scarcen, scrutinously, sicarious, solicitate, suffragatory, supportance, temporancous, trepidity, ubiquarian, undisroll, unhappen, volupsy, wilder*, v.n.

[1] *Biographia Literaria*, Chapter 12. Coleridge has also said, germanely: "To convey his meaning precisely is a debt which an author owes to his readers. He, therefore, who, to escape the charge of pedantry, will rather be misunderstood than startle a fastidious critic with an unusual term, may be compared to the man who should pay his creditor in base or counterfeit coin, when he had gold or silver ingots in his possession, to the precise amount of the debt; and this, under the pretence of their unshapeliness and want of the mint-impression." *Church and State*, &c. (ed. 1839), p. 118.

[2] "Il est dangereux de donner son approbation aux néologues. Les idées nouvelles qu'ils prétendent ne pouvoir émettre avec les res-

idiocy that has so polluted the waters which we draw from what was once the "well of English undefiled"; and the contemporaries of MM. Guizot and Victor Hugo must be stark imbeciles.[1]

Of new words we may enumerate at least five distinct sources. Those words which may be called inspired are due, almost wholly, to the common people; others are elaborated by the learned; others are imposed by conquest, as the Norman element of the English, and the Semitic element of the Indian vernaculars; others, all the world over, are imported by commerce; and others, still, are introduced from abroad by fashion, or are borrowed thence for their usefulness. It is with the two first classes and the last that we are concerned practically. Inspired neoterisms, as springing from the needs of the illiterate, often respond to a general need, and are easily enfranchised. Besides, being, mostly, mono-

---

sources ordinaires, sont, la plupart du temps, des rêveries réchauffées. Souvent aussi leur embarras provient de ce qu'ils ignorent leur métier, de ce qu'ils ne connaissent pas un assez grand nombre de vocables, et ne savent point appliquer, ou grouper à propos ceux qui sont à leur disposition." M. Francis Wey, *Remarques sur la Langue Française*, Vol. 1, pp. 172, 173.

"L'expérience démontre . . que les talents de second ordre sont ceux qui cherchent le plus les termes nouveaux." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 174, 175.

[1] "La Bruyère, a late celebrated writer among them [the French], makes use of many new terms which are not to be found in any of the common dictionaries before his time." Swift, *A Proposal*, &c.

However full, or defective, the dictionaries of his time may have been, La Bruyère would have been an exception among great writers, if he had not innovated, in his language. Even Swift did so, little as he seems to have suspected the fact. As to dictionaries, the Dean writes of them, as if he supposed their contents were countersigned beyond the stars.

syllables, they are easy of remembrance; and,—where not abbreviations,—being formed on the most obvious analogies, they are rarely exceptionable as illegitimate formations. However less immediately valuable for popular use, the coinages of scholars, in proportion as they supply recognized wants, likewise make good their value eventually, by obtaining the rights of citizenship. Intercourse with foreign countries and their inhabitants contributes further to augment our lingual wealth. And thus our exchequer is constantly increasing; and, at the same time, its contents are constantly liable to mutation. Once it was not so; but, now-a-days, we may accept, as an indubitable argument of a nation's healthy activity, both intellectual and material, the fact of the expansiveness and mobility of its language.

Strange things are to be found in the history of the words which we have, on the one hand, corrupted, and, on the other hand, have retrieved from corruption. With a list of a few of these, and a few remarks thereon, I shall close this chapter. And a thoughtful attention to this list, short as it is, will suffice to impress a variety of profitable conclusions. The purist may gather, from it, that much which he accepts simply because it is established, had its origin in gross ignorance, or in barbarous indifference. Nor will the philosophic philologist fail to be reminded, by it, that there is abundance of work to be done towards reducing our language to desirable regularity; and, in the success which has attended past labours in that direction, he will find some small encouragement to hope that future labours

to the same end will not be wholly unavailing. Every here and there, he will perceive, the efforts which have been made to ameliorate English have triumphed signally over the resistance of narrow and stolid conservatism. And further like efforts will, doubtless, have a like result. Let the reformer bear in mind, however, above all things, that, in order to the effecting of changes in our mother-tongue, he should guard heedfully against undue haste, and the offering of too many novelties at once, together with every other impolicy that may alarm the timid, or otherwise raise up obstacles to the realization of his beneficent project.

The old *lyvelyhede*, a formation akin to *likelihood*, once meant 'quickness';[1] and *lifelode*, in time changed to *lyvelode*, *lyfehode*, &c.,[2] meant 'way of life', and then 'means of living'. *Lyvelyhede*, modernized into *livelihood*,[3] lost its old sense; 'means of living' lost its old expression; and we now have a marriage between the surviving partners.

Rightwise, probably from mere slovenliness of pronunciation, passed into the mongrel *righteous*.[4]

---

[1] As late as 1635, I find: "The third, not ceding to the other two in blithsome *livelihood*, and feature of body, came, for all that, short of them in the rest." James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin*, p. 153.

[2] Hieron has a sermon, the dedication to which is dated in 1616, entitled *The Christians Live-loode*. Philemon Holland has *livelode* in his *Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 123.

[3] In its present meaning, only spelled *livelyhood*, this word was used by King James's revisers of the Bible, in their Preface, in 1612.

[4] With our *righteous*, in point of hybridism, compare, besides, the Scotch *wrongous*, *heathnicall* or *hethnicall*, used by Phillip Stubbes, in *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1585), pp. 211, 222 (ed. 1836). Lithgow has *hethnike*. See *The Totall Discourse*, &c. (1632), p. 397.

Bentley would hardly have discommended Stubbes's words, for he

No doubt we are to trace the origin of our now classical *helpmate*[1] to a corruption of the "*help meet* for him" of the Book of Genesis.[2]

---

gravely tells us: "The word *heathen* comes from ἔθνη." *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 129.

Similar assertions were very common in the days of pre-scientific philology.

"Τρύπανον, veterator, vafer. *Trupenie* non semel audivi, vel *an old trupenie*, de vafro et tenace. Obviæ sunt et aliæ rationes, scio, sed, quæ mihi magis arrideat, aut tam probabilis videatur, nulla." Meric Casaubon, *De Quatuor Linguis Commentatio*, Pars Prior (1650), p. 362.

Of such things the volume here quoted is pretty well made up, throughout.

[1] I have called the word classical. Lord Macaulay writes, in the third chapter of his *History*: "A waiting woman was generally considered as the most suitable *helpmate* for a parson."

A few references for the expression here follow. Mrs. Susanna Centlivre, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, Act 5. Vanbrugh and Colley Cibber, *The Provoked Husband* (1728), Act 5. Foote, *The Commissary*, Act 1. Cambridge, *The World*, No. 56. Edward Moore, *ibid.*, No. 183. Colman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, No. 44. Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, Vol. 3, p. 247. Wordsworth, *Poetical Works* (ed. 1846), Vol. 4, p. 321. Charles Lamb, *Final Memorials*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 106. Southey, *Colloquies*, &c. (ed. 1831), Vol. 2, p. 209. Mr. Charles Kingsley, *Two Years Ago* (ed. 1857), Vol. 3, p. 7. Mr. Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies* (ed. 1871), p. 77.

Helpmeet is not a compound to be defended; and yet it has been used by at least two writers of very high repute. See Southey, *Life of Wesley* (ed. 1864), Vol. 2, p. 161: Dr. Newman, *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (1872), p. 154. Also see Mr. Charles Kingsley, *Two Years Ago*, Vol. 2, p. 62. Mr. Jodrell and Dr. Worcester incredibly name Milton for it.

Bp. Sprat, under the date of 1692, has the compound *meet-help*, for 'wife'. See *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 217.

William Strode writes of "the yoak of a *meet helper*." *The Floating Island* (1636), Act 4, Scene 3.

[2] The following is taken from a work printed before the days of our authorized version of the Bible: "If the ancients would have their slaves corrected rather with words than blowes, much more ought the wife to be so dealt withall, whom God calleth a *helpe like* to us." *The French Academie*, Part I. (1589), p. 475.

Our *perspective*, as in the term 'science of *perspective*,' ought, by derivative rights, to signify 'microscopy and telescopy', or 'dioptrics generally'; and yet, in all probability, we shall never return to the old and correct *prospective*.

Inasmuch as *kerchief*, from the Old French *couvrechef*, means, etymologically, 'head-cover', our *pocket-handkerchief* and *neck-handkerchief*, when submitted to analysis, seem to designate articles intended for most complicated uses.[1]

Bridal, a word now suggestive of no beverage less luculent than champagne or sparkling moselle, originally meant 'marriage-feast', and took its name from the *ale* which was drunk in honour of the *bride*.

Anklet, *armlet*,[2] and *wristlet*, except to mean 'little ankle', &c., originated in pure ignorance; but no one would now think of using them in their etymological senses, or of avoiding them in their conventional senses.[3]

---

[1] See Mr. H. Fox Talbot's *English Etymologies*, p. 230.

[2] See the note at the foot of p. 144, *supra*.

[3] *Scientific*—for all that Ben Jonson, Gaule, and Milton, with Thomas Taylor, Charles Lamb, and Coleridge, in later times, have shown us the right word, *sciential*,—holds its ground, and is likely to go on holding it. Howell has *scientifial*. See *Dodona's Grove* (1640), p. 11.

Nor ought *deific* to signify, as it generally does signify, 'divine'. "*Deifick* liquor." Sir Thomas Urquhart, Translation of *Rabelais*, Vol. 2, p. 11 (ed. 1694). "*Deific* confrication." Bishop Lavington, *Enthusiasm of Methodists*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 210 (ed. 1754). "*Deific* energy", "*deific* fury". Thomas Taylor, *The Pamphleteer*, Vol. 8 (1816), pp. 54, 55.

"Some products we observe then to be naturally leprous; and such are usually struck with *morbifick* deformities." Franck, *Northern Memoirs* (ed. 1694), p. 295. The ending *-fick*—now *-fic*—has not, here, its proper force.

Almost everybody writes *aerolite*, *divest*, *forego*, *frontispiece*, *landscape*, *pander*, *posthumous*, *prothonotary*, *rhyme*,[1] and *Tartar*.[2] Some of these words once were spelled better than they are spelled now; and, when we amended *abhominable*,[3] *ancient*, *consort*,

---

"The most *petrific* column of stillness." Mr. De Quincey, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 261. Here, "most *petrific*" is simply 'most *petrified*'; and petrifaction, with Mr. De Quincey, is a thing that admits of degrees.

And then there is, as against the exact, but surfeiting, *telegrapheme*, our lawless *telegram*, to which is strictly applicable the maxim of the civilians, as regards a clandestine marriage: "Fieri non debuit, sed, factum, valet." Add the hideous *orthopædic*, which Cicero himself would have suffered us, for the sake of congruity, to call *sputatilic*. But I must cut short an enumeration of anomalies, which might be specified to tediousness.

[1] *Rime* and *ryme* were among the old English forms; and there is, at least, quite as good ground to refer the word to the Anglo-Saxon *rim*, of unknown parentage, as to ῥυθμός. Mr. De Quincey—Vol. 13, p. 102, foot-note,—asserts, with his usual peremptoriness, that "the Greek *rythmos* [*sic*] was, certainly, the remote fountain" of *rhyme*. Why, by the by,—as in Vol. 12, p. 266, foot-note,—does he write *rhodomontade*? Does he take it to be Hellenic?

Instead of *rimes*, many old books have *rhythmes*. So write most of the authors in *Ancient Critical Essays*, and, at a later period, Fuller and Henry More.

[2] "It must not be allowed", says Mr. De Quincey, "to weigh against the validity of a word once fairly naturalized by use, that, originally, it crept in upon an abuse or a corruption. Prescription is as strong a ground of legitimation, in a case of this nature, as it is in law." *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 201, foot-note. Still, as, where it seems to be at all practicable, there is nothing reprehensible in trying to reform a bad law, so, in like circumstances, there is nothing reprehensible in trying to reform a bad word; and one is at a loss to conjecture why, for instance, *The Times* newspaper should perseveringly persist in striving to inculcate or perpetuate such misspellings as *analyze*, *chymist*, and *diocess*.

[3] It has often been noticed, that our ancients conceived they improved *abominable* and *abomination*, by turning them into *abhominable* and *abhomination*. But *abhomenable* and *abhominatio* had much earlier been used in Old French.

According to Dr. Webster's editors, *abhominable* was "not uncom-

conster, decrepid, desart, emerods, eminent,[1] *epatic, ideot, president,*[2] *preheminence,*[3] *sirname, stupendious,*[4] and *substraction*, into *abominable, ensign, concert, construe, decrepit, desert, hæmorrhoids, imminent, hepatic, idiot, precedent, preeminence, surname, stupendous*, and

---

mon among writers of the Elizabethan period." And it was used in the time of Edward III. Both *abhominable* and *abhominacoun* occur in the *Apology for Lollard Doctrines;* and Wicliffe, in his New Testament, has *abhomynacioun*. Udall, Donne, and a few others of their respective ages, always put, I believe, *abominable*.

The Rev. Jonathan Boucher, remarking on *abhominable*, of which his first definition is "unmanly," is "not sure that this ancient spelling . . . may not lead us to a better etymology, *viz.*, to *ab* and *homo*, as implying something that is unworthy of a man, and, therefore, to be detested." But is fancy to be preferred to historic truth? How would he have derived Plautus's cognate *abomino?* And what notion can he have thought it conveyed to a Roman? He would have been pleased with Fuller, for his *abhominal*. See *The Appeal of Injured Innocence*, &c. (1659), Part 2, p. 90.

Very frequently, alike in Old Italian, in Old French, and in Old English, *h* was omitted from the beginning of some words, and prefixed to others, in defiance of all propriety. Nor did the abuse of *h* stop there. In Old French we find *rehedification*, and, in both Old French and Old Italian, an *h*, in their words corresponding to our old *preheminence* and *proheme*.

[1] This strange blunder, dating from the era of Queen Elizabeth, was long very common. Even Bentham has *eminently*, for *imminently*.

In old books I have found *emerge*, for *immerge; enumerable*, for *innumerable; illaborate*, for *elaborate; illude*, for *elude; immergent*, for *emergent; irradicate*, for *eradicate*. Lord Chesterfield has *illicit*, for *elicit*.

Sir T. N. Talfourd boldly, not from ignorance, uses *illucidate*, instead of *elucidate*. *Final Memorials of Charles Lamb*, Vol. 2, p. 47.

[2] If we account this error typographical, there must have been a wide-spread conspiracy among old printers to pseudographize, and authors must have been strangely compliant to their inferiors in knowledge. *President*, for *precedent*,—like *eminent*, for *imminent*,—it may rather be believed, established itself through carelessness or ignorance, and was kept up because it was not thought worth while to change it. To apportion the fault of such blunders between author and printer is impossible; but, for all the officiousness of printers, authors must have been much more yielding, formerly, than they are now-a-days, if

[3 4 Notes in the next page.]

subtraction, we went amiss in meddling with *assise*, *choise*, *cifre*, *danse*, *extrinsec*, *ferrier*, *forceable*, *forain*, *fornace*, *hainous*, *juge*, *lern*, *loge*, *prise*, *rost*, *seise*, *tranquility*, *vitious*, *vultur*, *wrack*, and hundreds upon hundreds of their fellows.[1]

---

they delegated their choice of phraseology to others. That many an expression which we read in books is there on the sole authority of the type-setter or press-corrector is, however, to be presumed. I myself have had a homely *folks* smartened into *persons*; fortune having been kind in saving me from *individuals* or *parties*.

Referring to the time when the plays of Shakespeare were first given to the world, Dr. Johnson has asserted, that, "in no other age was the art of printing in such unskilful hands." On the contrary, to whomever the credit belonged, for carefulness and uniformity of spelling,—certain options being allowed for,—books printed before the accession of Charles I. are, in general, far superior to books printed during the hundred years that next followed.

[3] This form I find used by two writers within the last hundred years. See Charles Johnson, *Chrysal* (ed. 1777), Vol. 3, pp. 257, 277: Godwin, *An Enquiry*, &c. (ed. 1793), p. 461.

Flea, for *flay*, is accepted by Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 1, p. 206; and by Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c. (1794), p. 260.

Flay, the verb, and *flea*, the name of the insect, were once pronounced exactly alike, as I learn from Richard Hodges, *The Plainest Directions for the True Writing of English*, &c. (1649), p. 8.

[4] Archdeacon Todd and others have shown that Milton and Derham use this form, which is still a cockneyism. I find it in Henry Earl of Monmouth, Isaac Barrow, the Duke of Buckingham, Sir William Temple, Jeremy Collier, Steele, Mandeville, and Bp. Warburton, also. De Foe has *stupenduous*. And so has Henry Brooke, in *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 3, p. 241. His *tremenduous* and *tremenduously* match it.

In the early work by Warburton, from which I find that he wrote *stupendious*, occur *enormious*, *monstruous*, and *viscuous*. Many an old writer has *barbarious*; Glanvill, *tenuious*. Some of these spellings I refer to by and by.

[1] Many spellings typified by *arbitrement*, *atchieve*, *colledge*, *extream*, *meer*, *scrophulous*, have been altered for the better. But we can make no boast of uniformity. While throwing out the *h* from *ghesse*, an *old form* of our *guess*, we have retained it in *ghastly* and *ghost*; and,

The *l* in the *-ble* of *syllable* is entirely intrusive;[1] and so it is in the *-cle* of *treacle;*[2] as is the *d* in *gender* and in the adjective *tender.*

Ancient, cormorant, currant, parchment, peasant, pennant, pheasant, truant, and *tyrant*[3] simulate Latin endings to which, etymologically, they have no right.[4]

---

though we have improved *conveigh* into *convey*, we have left *inveigh* untouched. We write *heathen* and *stead*, but no longer *shoar* and *smoak; pamphlet*, but no more *gulph* and *prophane; frenzy*, but not, as of old, *fantasm; receipt*, though we have given up *deceipt*. We have *abound, maintain*, and *rally*, but *abundance, maintenance*, and *raillery*. *Scense* would match *scent; teatre, treasure*. What we are pleased to call our orthography is, in short, a perfect chaos.

Even Milton could write, instead of *ferula, feruler*, a spelling in vogue at least a century before his time. Compare *dagger*, from *daga*.

Messager and *passager*, as has often been remarked, have undergone something of the same change, in becoming *messenger* and *passenger*, that the vulgar have wrought, in devising *sausenger*.

Our *asparagus* was, a long while ago, *sparage, sperage*, and *sparagus*. Steele, in *The Tatler*, No. 150, has *sparagrass*. In Walker's *Dictionary*, which was a great authority with our grandfathers and grandmothers, we are told, touching *asparagus*, that "the corruption of this word into *sparrowgrass* is so general, that *asparagus* has an air of stiffness and pedantry."

But to remarks of this sort there is no limit.

[1] Ascham, in *The Scholemaster*, writes *sillabe;* Ben Jonson, in his *Grammar, syllabe;* and so writes Sir F. H. Doyle, in his *Lectures on Poetry* (1869). The insertion of the superfluous *l*—which no language but ours exhibits, and which does not appear in *syllabic*,—is easily accounted for. An *l* was slipped into the *-be* of *syl-la-be*, to give the word a more English appearance; and, in course of time, it got to be pronounced, and was welcome, as giving the organs of speech something more prehensible than before to take hold of. This is only conjecture, of course.

[2] From θηριακή, ultimately; as *syllable* comes from συλλαβή.

[3] The conjugates of our forefathers' *tyran*—which is still the French form,—would be *tyrantal, tyrantize, tyrance* or *tyrantry*, &c. The feminine *tyranness* occurs in Richardson's novels. *Tyran* itself was not quite obsolete in 1655. See Edward Terry, *A Voyage to East-India*, p. 99.

[4] And formerly we had *margent, talent*, and *turbant*, for *margin, talon*, and *turban*.

Nor is any regard for rule or regularity to be seen in our headless *able, bishop, cates, chequer, diamond, fence, gipsy, pert, plaster, raiment, scorch, story, tansy, vales, vanguard;*[1] in our decurtate *cab, cent, chap,*

Puritants was, at one time, very common. Conversely, there has been an attempt to introduce into French such forms as *enfans*, for *enfants*.

Mabbe has *lancent*, for *lancet*. *The Rogue*, Part 2, p. 142. Gray writes of an *oppidant* of Eton! *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 283.

The old *tenent*, for *tenet*, probably belongs to the same class of corruptions. That *tenent* imitated, in appearance, an active participle, and not a passive, was a trifle to our ancestors. Dr. Webster's editors —copying Mr. B. H. Smart, and without thanks,—define *tenent*, as contrasted with *tenet*, to be "a tenet held by several persons," and assert that it was once "used by pedants who affected great accuracy." Others than such long used it. And is it proved that *tenent* was ever employed as if understood to be a third person plural? With *tenet* compare the *habitat* of naturalists.

Aliant and *alient*, for *alien*, are frequent in old books. Both forms occur in the original edition of the authorized version of the Bible, and also in the earlier Geneva version.

Intiment and *orphant*, for *intimate* and *orphan*, with other kindred depravations unnoticed by the lexicographers, must be familiar to all students of our older literature.

[1] From *habilis, episcopus, acates, exchequer, adamas, defence, Egyptian, apert, emplastrum, arraiment*, Old French *escorcher, historia, athanasia, avails, avant-garde*.

Here, as in the note after the next, I have advisedly given Latin or Low Latin forms, in preference to Greek.

I may add *teens*, as where we speak of 'a girl in her *teens*.' This word was used by Henry Earl of Monmouth, as early as 1656.

In some parts of England, the humbler orders give the name *steel*, formerly applied to a prison, to a union or workhouse. It is simply the last syllable of *Bastile*. To such influences as operated here we are indebted, no question, for most of our verbal reductions, as *dropsy*, instead of which, Udall, with many of the learned long after him, wrote *hydropsy*.

The list given in the text is short, compared with what it might be, especially if we went back to Old English. The Italian contains hundreds upon hundreds of similar abbreviations, such as *fante, ipocrita, lattovaro, lustrissimo, nemico, omicidio, pitaffio, ragno, rameso, romito, scuro, vangelo, verno, uomo, usignuolo*, from *infans, hypocrita,*

demi-rep, extra, mob, phiz;[1] or in such shrivels as *aid, alms, balm, blame, coy, crown, dime, dirge, dowry, idolatry, ink, lightning, mercy, oil, palsy, pence, priest, ransom, remnant, surgeon, vindictive.*[2]

---

electuarium, illustrissimus, inimicus, homicidium, epitaphium, aranea, Mauriscus, eremita, obscurus, evangelium, hibernus, homo, lusciniola.

[1] Apocopated from *cabriolet, centesimus, chapman, demi-reputation, extraordinary, mobile, physiognomy.*

The *cent* referred to is the coin. In 'ten per *cent.*,' &c., we have an abbreviation of *centum.*

Extra has come to be a substantive, after being used to mean, from the influence of its context, 'additional', 'supernumerary'. And latterly we have taken to using *ultra*, a preposition, with the same latitude. Analogous to this *ultra* would be *intra*, to signify 'internal' and 'inmate'.

[2] Referable to *adjutus, eleemosyna, balsam, blaspheme, quietus, corona, decimus, dirige, dotarium, idololatria, encaustum, lightening, misericordia, oleum, paralysis, pennies, presbyter, redemptio, remanent, chirurgeon, vindicative.*

CHAPTER VI.

NEOTERISTIC CANONS.

Die Muttersprache zugleich reinigen und bereichern ist das Geschäft der besten Köpfe; Reinigung ohne Bereicherung erweist sich öfters geistlos: denn es ist nichts bequemer als von dem Inhalt absehen, und auf den Ausdruck passen.—*Goethe.*

Let us dare to enrich the language in which we write, by design; but let us not debauch it by inadvertence.—*William Godwin.*

WHAT between the activity of modern life and the productiveness of modern reflection, new words offer themselves for trial, in peculiar abundance; and it behoves us to try them. But what are the considerations by which we are to be governed, in determining to harbour, or to discard, them?

The principal, obviously, are prompted by observation of the fate of words in the vicissitudes which English has heretofore undergone. Of philosophical purifications effected except by instinct, our language has as few to show as any other. It may, however, be safely predicted, that, in the future, unless our successors lapse into barbarism, unphilosophical depravations of our language will be comparatively rare. Even now, ignorance and chance, which have availed so largely to load our tongue with anomalies, are no longer, as regards it, other than an insignificant source of mutation. From mere impulse of expedience, we shall go on, as we have always gone on, *supplying* blanks, curing ambiguities, and removing

excrescences; but, in time to come, in distinction from the past, our innovations, whatever they may be, will, in the main, be controlled by analogy. We shall continue to change our language, and, very generally, for the better; and the motives for changing it will be the same, in character, with those which have operated towards rendering it what it is. Whatever is new, or whatever, though old, has an inadequate verbal representative, demands, and at last obtains, its appropriate expression. There are, besides, neoterisms occasioned by alteration in the import of words already existing. Neoterisms of this stamp fall under four classes; and each of these classes would provide matter for a long disquisition. Here, however, they must be despatched very briefly, as must the point of the riddance of excrescences, just spoken of, and which presents itself for prior attention.

A word becomes superfluous, when another word, whatever its merit in comparison, has irretrievably usurped its ancient rights. Of words which, to all appearance, have been needlessly ousted from our language, certain very old ones are among the most interesting. Such are *againsaw* for *contradiction*, *burstness* for *hernia*, *dealtaking* for *participation*, *dearworth* for *precious*, *fleshhood* for *incarnation*, *girdlestead* for *waist*, *inwit* for *conscience*, *onlight* for *illuminate*, *outling* for *external*, *outtake* for *except*, *outwending* for *departure*, *shriftfather* for *confessor*, *threeness* for *trinity*, *unwittingness* for *ignorance*, *wanehope* for *despair*, *witword* for *testimony*.[1]

[1] It is not much to be wondered at, that we lost bedsister for concu-

I. As contributory to the production of neoterisms, some expressions lay down their old senses altogether, and acquire new ones. Examples are seen in *by and by*, 'immediately afterwards'; *carriage*, 'burthen'; *conversation*, 'behaviour'; *desirous*, 'desirable'; *futile*, 'loquacious'; *general*, 'pertaining to all'; *ignore*, 'not to know'; *kindly*, 'natural'; *prevent*, 'anticipate'; *religionist*,[1] 'bigot'; *usury*, 'interest'.

II. Multivocal expressions drop a sense, to convey which a new expression, where required, is often contrived, or borrowed; or they are dealt with by such simple processes as those to which we owe *antic* and *antique*.[2] In addition to other meanings, *act* once signified 'actuate'; *artificial*, 'devised with skill', 'ingenious'; *cheapen*, 'ask the price of'; *civility*, 'civiliza-

---

bine, *beseechinglike* for *propitious*, *footfast* for *captive*, *geldhood* for *barrenness*, *leadinglike* for *ductile*, *loseness* for *absolution*, *undeadly* for *immortal*, *unfillinglike* for *insatiable*, *unfullmaking* for *imperfection*, *wedbreak* for *adulterer*, *yearninglike* for *desirable*.

Many of their fellows dropped out of use, it may be, in consequence, partly, of the obsoleting of their bases; as *groundstaddleness* for *foundation*, *underganging* for *humiliation*, *unroningness* for *desolation*, *untholinglike* for *unendurable*, *witherwin* for *adversary*.

For readier intelligibility, I have modernized such elements of these ancient words as have living representatives. Thus, *beseechinglike* is for *besekanlik*, *loseness* is for *lesness*, *wanehope* is for *wanhope*, &c. &c.

[1] The only sense this word now has, 'partisan of a religion,' is strangely confounded with the older sense, by Dr. Webster's editors, and is not recognized at all by Dr. Johnson. See, for it, Henry More, *Mystery of Godliness*, p. 520; *Mystery of Iniquity*, pp. 538, 542: Bp. Warburton, *A Selection*, &c., p. 364.

So our *family* has risen above the disparaging signification of *familia*.

[2] Add *beside* and *besides*, *born* and *borne*, *canon* and *cannon*, *cloths* and *clothes*, *course* and *coarse*, *diverse* and *divers*, *flour* and *flower*, *foul* and *fowl*, *humane* and *human*, *least* and *lest*, *muscle* and *mussel*, *oar* and *ore*, *sea* and *see*, *staid* and *stayed*, *story* and *storey*, *then* and *than*, *waste* and *waist*.

tion'; *collection*, 'inference'; *commodity*, 'commodiousness'; *complexion*, 'temperament', 'idiosyncrasy'; *desirable*, 'regrettable'; *dreadful*, 'in fear'; *loathsome*, 'affected with nausea', 'squeamish', 'queasy'; *meanly*, 'moderately'; *respective*, 'testifying respect', 'respectful'; *without*, 'unless'.[1] *Utilize* is fast antiquating *improve*, in the sense of 'turn to account'. *Dialectic* and *suspicious* would, each, advantageously be eased of an acceptation, by the adoption of *dialectal*[2] and *suspectable*.[3]

---

[1] *Importable* used to mean 'unbearable'; *inhabitable*, 'uninhabitable', as it still means in French; *intreatable*, 'inexorable'; *investigable*, 'unsearchable'. These for specimens.

"My five wits have I fouly misspent." This quaint bit of penitence is from Henry the Eighth's *Primer*.

[2] It is used by Mr. Henry O'Brien, in *The Round Towers of Ireland*, pp. 121, 128, 213, 248, 481.

[3] Richardson has this word in his *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 6, p. 93. Henry More has *unsuspectable*. *Mystery of Godliness* (ed. 1660), p. 323.

Suspicable—but not in the Latin sense of *suspicabilis*, 'conjectural',—occurs in Henry More, *Mystery of Godliness*, pp. 121, 139. At p. 151, is *suspicability*.

Suspectful, in the subjective sense, is used by Howell, in *Dodona's Grove*, pp. 21, 26, 56. Probably, we are to take it from the old substantive *suspect*, 'suspicion'.

The word *triumphant* illustrates instructively how propriety in language may depend on the development of lingual resources. Besides its present sense, it would have to bear the burthen of *triumphal*, as well, but for the latter word's being available. Formerly, it was, indeed, often put for *triumphal*, notwithstanding the assertion of Dr. Webster's editors, that such use is "rare". A few references for it, as so employed, follow. Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Governour* (1531), fol. 188 (ed. 1580): *The Image of Governance* (1544), fol. 104. Sir John Haywarde, *The First Part of the Life and Reigne of King Henrie the IIII* (1599), p. 71. Philemon Holland, *The Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 79. Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse*, &c. (1632), p. 357. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), pp. 34, 166, 250. Hamon L'Estrange, *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), pp. 55,

III. So-called synonyms are desynonymized.[1]

218. Glanvill, *Essays*, &c. (1676), IV., p. 43. Horace Walpole, *Historic Doubts* (ed. 1768), p. 36. These references might be increased tenfold.

Dr. Johnson quotes passages which make mention of "a *triumphal* car", and of "a *triumphant* car". Though, of course, they are one and the same, he defines the first as "used in celebrating victory"; the second, as "celebrating a victory."

We have, in what is now regarded as the only right use of *contemptible*, another illustration of the point just above adverted to. This word, in passing, Shakespeare, De Foe, Jeremy Collier, Richardson, Sterne, Gibbon, and many writers besides, have employed in the sense of 'contemptuous'. A real original, *contemptibilis*, has furnished us with *contemptible;* but we have had to imagine *contemptuosus*, in order to frame *contemptuous*. Latin verbs active we have largely turned into verbs neuter, and, to some extent, neuters into actives; and *contemptuous* might have been dispensed with, if we had agreed to make *contemptible* serve a double purpose, after the ineligible precedent of *penetrabilis*, 'penetrable' and 'penetrating'. 'A *contemptible* estimate' would, in that case, have been both objective and subjective; it would have denoted 'that which *deserves* contempt' and 'that which *expresses* contempt'. *Despicable* and *mean*, in general connexions, are objective; and yet, from poverty, we have wrenched them, in 'a *despicable* opinion', 'a *mean* opinion', &c., into a subjective sense. Similarly, in our penury, we talk of 'a *consumptive* complaint', and also of 'a *consumptive* person'. So, too, *minute* qualifies 'researches', as well as 'particles'. More than once I have ventured, in print,—as in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, and elsewhere,—an expression like '*minutiose* investigations', which seems to me to be not only unexceptionable, but much needed.

In languages of great ductility, equivocals like those just referred to are rarely found. Such a language is that of the ancient Hindus; and I once moved my Pandit to inexpressible bewilderment, by proposing to translate '*learned* book' literally into Sanskrit. Again, though the Romans said '*insolens* homo', '*insolens* dictum', to mean '*insolent* remark', would have been unintelligible to them; and, in our own phrase, we have metaphorically transferred to a thing a property which, originally, appertained restrictively to the mind. For it does not appear that *insolent* was ever used, by us, to denote 'unusual', 'strange', and, from the too common tendency to consider anything new as intrusive and objectionable, passed, as applied to external objects, to its present acceptation.

[1] Professor Grote's *despecificate* is preferable to Coleridge's *desynonymize*. *See The Journal of Philology*, Vol. 4 (1872), p. 63.

To form an idea of the extent to which our language has been desynonymized, one has only to compare together our words derived, mediately, or immediately, from the Latin, and those which they at first represented. Of these pairs there are hundreds upon hundreds; and yet of not a single pair are the members strictly identical in import. Take, for example, *acid* and *sour*, *cordial* and *hearty*, *crime* and *guilt*, *divine* and *godlike*, *juvenile* and *youthful*, *lucid* and *bright*, *miserable* and *unhappy*, *ponderous* and *weighty*, *portion* and *share*, *quantity* and *deal*, *sufficient* and *enough*. Where, moreover, two words, of which one is a material corruption of the other, are taken from a foreign source, we find them very far from being synonyms. *Cure* [1] and *care*, *engine* and *gin*, *paralysis* and *palsy*, *penitence* and *penance*, *phantasy* and *fancy*, *piety* and *pity*, are instances in point.

IV. Univocal terms take on a plurality of significations.

Among the various blemishes which may disfigure a language, none, abstractedly considered, is more unphilosophical than multivocals; and with these, as almost any page of the dictionary demonstrates, English is already crowded.[2] As to a language whose

---

I soon state my reasons for disliking the term *synonym*. Its derivatives are, of course, as objectionable as itself.

[1] Its original sense is still retained in the expression '*cure* of souls'.

[2] Among those which have sprung up in recent times are the verbs *base*, *bond*, *bracket*, *certificate*, *coal*, *engineer*, *grade*, *outline*, *supplement*, *warehouse*, *wood*; and the substantives *affluent*, *bathe*, *cereal*, *climb*, *convalescent*, *periodical*, *remand*, *serial*.

Apostate was once a verb, as well as a substantive and adjective; *manage* was formerly used for *management*; *impulsive*, for *impulse*. Some people were, of old, *exceeding* rich, and others were extreme

character and method of development have acquired stability, we have, however, little practical concern with those principles which, if the visionary scheme of constructing a new language were in agitation, would be deemed imperative. These high matters we may well leave to the consideration of Bishop Wilkins, when, with the aid of Pâṇini and Priscian, he shall be commissioned to elaborate a lingua Paradisiaca. Returning to this world, of all the parts of speech recognized by grammarians, there is scarcely any which, as relates to some word or other, we have not burthened with a function additional to its original one. Our verbs that began with being substantives or adjectives, and our substantives that began with being adjectives or verbs, to proceed no further, may be reckoned by thousands; and they will go on accumulating. But, whether due to tropology, or to whatever other cause, multivocals,[1] as conducing to brevity and expressiveness, are unwisely condemned, or deprecated, except where they entail ambiguity.[2]

---

poor. A fair woman was *a fair*; and the world swarmed with *extravagants*, *impertinents*, *indelicates*, *insensibles*, *punies*, *religious*, and *resolutes*, now extinct.

To give an idea of a multivocal is all that I have here essayed.

[1] These are of three sorts. I. Polysemants, where there is identity of form in the symbols of primary significations and their derivatives; as (*a*) *burst*, *cast*, *cost*, *cut*, *hit*, presents, preterites, and participles; as (*b*) *love*, substantive and verb, or *ill*, adjective, adverb, and substantive; and as (*c*) *post*, *stage*, the substantives. II. Homographs, identical to the eye; as *base*, *bore*, *dun*, *fair*, *file*, *grave*, *hail*, *host*, *lead*, *light*, *low*, *mail*, *match*. *mean*, *mystery*, *pale*, *pallet*, *sole*, in their various senses. III. Homophones, identical to the ear only; as *ail* and *ale*, *air* and *heir*, *all* and *awl*, *altar* and *alter*, *bail* and *bale*, *bare* and *bear*, *be* and *bee*.

[2] *Exigent* and *occurrent* were once used where we use, in a concrete

The chief criteria by which to test a new expression, with reference to its legitimacy, and, inclusively, with reference to the likelihood of its being adopted for general or special use, shall now be tentatively formulated.

First of all, a new word ought to supply an antecedent blank; or else, on the score of exactness, perspicuity, brevity, or euphony, it ought to be an improvement on a word already existing. Many a new word has been repudiated, at first sight, as being synonymous with one in received use, and as

---

sense, *exigence* and *occurrence*. If, while adopting the latter, but as abstracts, we had retained the former, we should, certainly, not have done amiss.

Instead of our good old *memorize*, Mr. De Quincey again and again —see his *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 41; Vol. 5, p. 227; Vol. 6, p. 245, &c. &c.,—substitutes *memorialize*, a word already legitimately and usefully preoccupied.

By the by, this word, in its current sense, was scouted, early in our century, as an Americanism.

And just as blameworthy as Mr. De Quincey's *memorialize* is his *degradation*, for 'gradation of a gradation'; as *decompound* means 'compound of a compound'. See his *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 288. In this, however, he had been anticipated by Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* Vol. 2, Ch. 9.

"It took the regular musketeer two or three minutes to alter his *missile* weapon into a weapon with which he could encounter an enemy hand to hand." So writes Lord Macaulay, in his *History*, Chapter 13, with allusion to the old-fashioned bayonet, which was screwed inside the barrel of a musket.

A javelin, a thing 'to be sent', is a *missile* weapon; and a musket, a thing 'which sends', is here designated by the same appellative. If Lord Macaulay had precedent for calling a musket *missile*, it is as good as unknown; and, besides, one signification is quite enough for such an adjective. A club, or a drum-stick, is not *pulsatile*; the air is not *inflatile*; and a hangman, in whatever sense a *pensive*, is not a *pensile*, minister of justice. *Projectile*, the adjective, even if it has the two meanings given it by the Dictionaries, is no proper model for imitation.

being, therefore, superfluous.[1] But what we have long and loosely called synonyms[2] are now understood to be, with trifling exceptions, pseudo-synonyms, by which are meant vocables approximating in import, but not equipollent or interchangeable. When *galvanism*, *ozone*, and *chloroform* were discovered, and when *locomotives* and *stereoscopes* were invented, it was necessary to have names for them. *Cult* is a term which, as we value exactness, we can ill do without, seeing how completely *religion*[3] has lost its original signification. *Civility*, formerly the

[1] Location is appreciably distinguishable from *place*, *seat*, *site*, &c.; and *locate*—long before which we had *dislocate*,—is, therefore, not to be condemned as surplusage. In the same way we may defend *adulate*, *compete*, *narrate*, and hundreds more of our modernisms.

Nor is *gratefulness* justly liable to demur; it being no more the same as *gratitude*, than *carefulness* is the same as *care*, or than *fraudulence* is the same as *fraud:* also compare *humbleness* and *sincereness* with *humility* and *sincerity*. Yet Mr. Blackley, at p. 183 of his *Word Gossip*, instances it among "words for which equivalents already exist." The four authorities for it quoted by Dr. Johnson and Archdeacon Todd did not think so. To those authorities I may add *Tarlton's Jests*, &c. (ed. Mr. J. O. Halliwell), p. 78: Lodowick Carlell, *The Deserving Favorite* (1629), Acts 2 and 5: James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), p. 111: Richard Tickell, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 302: Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 10, Ch. 2: Mr. Thackeray, *Esmond* (ed. 1852), Vol. 1, p. 241.

[2] The exact technicality is *homœosemants*. *Synonym*, only that it is rooted as firmly as *artery*, we might advantageously part with. In the accepted sense of 'word exactly consignificative with another word', it stands for what we very rarely have to do with. Further, in Greek, besides that *συνώνυμα* seldom means 'homœosemants', *συνώνυμος*, 'univocal', is, generally, opposed to *ὁμώνυμος*, 'equivocal'. Again, *συνώνυμα* are, ordinarily, things, not the verbal signs of things.

[3] The erroneousness of our Dictionaries, in their explanations of *religion*, as used in the English of our New Testament, would be amazing, if anything in any of those works could amaze one. For correct information on the sense of *religion*, see Archbishop Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament*.

substantive of both *civil* and *civilize*,—the latter of which it was not likely to suggest, except by help of its context,[1]—was judiciously relieved of one of its meanings, by *civilization*. *Financial*, *international*, *noticeable*, and *pretentious* enable us to dispense with periphrases. *Ugsome*,[2] for *ugly*, is a good sample of words which have been dismissed from our language, because of their offensiveness to the ear.

Secondly, a new word should obey some analogy; and, the less recondite the analogy, the better. Shakespeare uses *insuppressive*, for *insuppréssible*; and both he and Milton, with Brathwait[3] between, use *unexpressive*, for *unexpressible*. Dekker,[4] Massinger,[5] Howell,[6] and Foote,[7] have *suburbian*; Warton, *suburb-*

---

[1] There are many words instead of which, though no such plea can be urged against them, others have recklessly been employed. I name a few of the needless substitutes. *Defial*. William Taylor, *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 57 (1824), p. 509. *Detainal*. *Id.*, *The Annual Review*, Vol. 4 (1806), p. 116. *Obtainal*. *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 1 (1803), p. 355. *Retainal*, *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 2 (1804), p. 631; Vol. 5 (1807), p. 201. *Conformance*. Southey, *Works of William Cowper*, Vol. 2, p. 128: Mr. Hawthorne, *Our Old Home* (Boston ed. of 1864), p. 233. Horace Walpole has *blueth* and *greenth*.

Epitomator, used by Mr. H. F. Clinton and Professor Samuel Lee, though regularly evolved,—as we have *syncopate* from *syncope*, and *cultivator* from *cultivate*,—is not needed. And no more do we require *continuator*, *declamator*, *examinator*, *perfectionator*, and *valuator*, which, with many kindred duplicates, are found in books.

[2] This and *ugsomeness* are favourite words with Bishop Latimer. Stubbes has the still more hideous *ugglesome*. *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1585), pp. 67, 226 (ed. 1836). Instead of *ugly*, we had, for a long while, *ougly*.

[3] *The English Gentleman*, p. 264. Fuller has *expressive*, for 'expressible'. *Good Thoughts*, &c. (ed. 1830), p. 181.

[4] *A Knights Conjuring*, p. 55: *The Dead Tearme* (1608), sig. C 1 r.

[5] *The City Madam*, Act 3, Scene 1; Act 4, Scene 1.

[6] *Dodona's Grove*, p. 43.

[7] *The Minor*, Act 1.

ial. Steele and Addison could write *rhinocerical.*[1] Mr. De Quincey,[2] like a few authors before him,[3] has employed *metamorphize,*[4] instead of *metamorphose.*

[1] *The Tatler*, No. 260. *Rhinocerotic* will do perfectly. Anon., *The World*, No. 150. *Rhinocerote* or *rhinocerot* was an old form of the substantive. See Ben Jonson, *Timber, ad fin.:* Edward Terry, *A Voyage to East-India* (1655), p. 109.

[2] *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 105.

[3] Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame* (1592), p. 43 (ed. 1841). Christofer Symes, *A Bachelors Blessing*, &c. (1644), p. 67. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), p. 212.

[4] *Epitomize*, as an English formative, is unassailable; and it has a real basis in *epitome.* Nor are the *amalgamize* of Richard Franck, and the *evaporize* of Prof. H. H. Wilson and Mr. Isaac Taylor, though unneeded, formed against rule. As to *metamorphize*, however, it is not built up on any Greek word, naturalized or unnaturalized; and, further, it presupposes the derivative *μεταμορφή*, which, in default of the verb *μόρφω*, is impossible. There being a verb *μορφόω*, *μεταμόρφωσις* is quite regular.

Our *metamorphose* we took from the French *métamorphoser;* and we might have had the same verb, if we had had, like the French, the substantive, *métamorphose.* Compare *phrase* and *paraphrase*, substantives and verbs: and James Hayward, in *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), pp. 226, 228, has *parenthesed* and *parenthesing*, based on the substantival *parenthese.* When we wanted verbs corresponding to *apheresis*, *apotheosis*, *emphasis*, *hypostasis*, *hypothesis*, *parenthesis*, *periphrasis*, *synopsis*, and *synthesis*, we made *apheresize*, *apotheosize*, *emphasize*, *hypostasize*, *hypothesize*, *parenthesize*, *periphrasize*, *synopsize*, and *synthesize*, all which I have seen in actual use. The regular verb of *metamorphosis* would be *metamorphosize.*

Like *metamorphose* are the very recent *anastomose* and *diagnose*, from the French *s'anastomoser* and *diagnoser.* The French substantives are *anastomose* and *diagnose;* ours, *anastomosis* and *diagnosis;* and our verbs ought to be *anastomosize* and *diagnosize.* None but professors of leechcraft require these verbs; and, with them, an extra syllable or two is always welcome, particularly if it contributes to darken counsel.

This note on what the Germans call word-building I am tempted to prolong a little. And first I will remark on two words of much more common occurrence than any of those previously spoken of. These are *analyse* and *paralyse*, the latter of which is very modern with us. On the French substantives *analyse* and *paralysie* were based the verbs *analyser* and *paralyser;* and from them we made our verbs. *Our analysis* and *paralysis* would have yielded *analysize* and *paralysize.*

Dr. Noah Webster, as many are aware, would have had us *systemize* our language, no matter at what cost of *enigmizing* it; and, if we had heeded his bidding,

---

If our substantives had been *analyse*—which, indeed, Henry More uses in his *Mystery of Iniquity*, p. 276,—and *paralyse*, the verbs might well have had the same form.

Hence it appears how unetymological it is to write *analyze* and *paralyze*. These mis-scripts look as if descendants of ἀναλύζω and παραλύζω, which are nothing; and, as I have shown, as little have *analyse* and *paralyse* to do with ἀναλύσω and παραλύσω, futures of ἀναλύω and παραλύω, and, therefore, not words to beget others.

Anastomose and *diagnose*, spoken of above, remind me of *axial*, *sub-clavian*, and *ungueal*. And then there is *dynameter*, with the *monomial* of the mathematicians,—for the latter of which, Mr. De Quincey, in *The Logic of Political Economy* (ed. 1844), pp. ix., 128, laudably substitutes the right formation,—slavishly copied from the French, for *dynamometer* and *mononomial*. The time has long past for such syncopations and compressions as gave us *arbalist*, *governor*, *pedant*, and *proctor*, from *arcubalista*, *gubernator*, *pædagogans*, and *procurator*. See, for more such shortenings, pp. 162, 163, *supra*.

Technology, for 'terminology', should also be mentioned, as an ignorant Gallicism which seems to be creeping into use, especially under the patronage of Scotchmen. William Taylor should have known better than to misemploy it; for so he did, in 1799. See *Memoir*, &c., by Mr. Robberd, Vol. 1, p. 289.

Hippodonomia is the title of a work, by Mr. Bracy Clark, published in 1829, on the *horse's foot*.

It is a pity to see the technicalities of the so-called liberal professions disfigured by foreignisms. Our scientists, since they will neoterize, would find their account in entertaining a few consulting philologists.

It is very unsafe to accept recent French words of classical extraction, without examining them closely. *Bibliophile* ought to mean, regularly, 'loved by books'. *Bibliophilist*, suggested by it, is just as bad. And no better is *toxophilite*, which has been in use since 1812, at least. Ascham's *Toxophilus* would, probably, have been taken, by an ancient, for something totally different from what is intended by it.

In a recent quarrel between two French newspaper-editors, one of the combatants, with design to annihilate the journal of his antagonist by a single withering epithet, denounced it as *hydroprêtre*. The poor man's studies had been neglected, as regarded *hydrophobe*, to the wrong half of which he unfortunately helped himself, towards devising his new compound.

our hands would have been restrained from *stigmizing* and *anathemizing*[1] him as a *pragmic dogmist* in matters *grammic*. On the monstrosities which our penny-a-liners, once *under way* for *plain-sailing*, engender daily, I spare to dilate. It is, however, manifest enough, that the *sacerdocracy* of *trustworthless benevolists* and *philosophobists* who would serve as our *emancipists*[2] from the bondage of coining words according to rule, have never been confined to the brood of ephemeral scribblers, any more than to mole-eyed philological sciolists.[3] But, as Fuller puts it,

---

[1] The substantive *anathemizing* is actually used by Taylor, the Water-poet. See his *Works* (ed. 1630), Vol. 2, p. 303.

But words just as illegitimate can be had, in any number, for the seeking. *Ignomy*. Shakespeare. *Inveterably*. Colly Cibber, *The Careless Husband*, Act 5. *Obtundity*. Aaron Hill, *Works* (ed. 1753), Vol. 1, p. 259. *Illustricity*. Miss Talbot, *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 376: Miss Carter, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 2, pp. 51, 360. *Squirrelline*. Mr. Ruskin, *Fors Clavigera*, Letter 18, p. 4. Gray has *woful-wan;* Horace Walpole, *gloomth;* Mrs. Thrale, *adjectivial;* Cowper, *godlike-wise;* Sydney Smith, *syntaxical;* Lady Hester Stanhope, *primosity*. But who does not know scores of such malformations?

Admittible, we are told by Archdeacon Todd, is "the proper orthography, instead of *admittable*"! It is lamentable to discover, that lexicographers are just as fallible as the rest of mankind.

[2] In books of recent date, I have met with all the five abnormities grouped in this sentence.

[3] Mr. Isaac Taylor coins, from *impart*, the lawless *impartation*, in which Dr. Webster's editors, almost of course, find nothing to censure. Morphologically considered, either *impartment* or *impartition* is the right word. *Impartation* would be paralleled by *defination*, for *definition*. The bases of the correct words are, respectively, *impartit-* and *definit-*.

Among the peculiar words of Mr. Isaac Taylor, I may mention the substantives *beckon*, *defusion*, *inburst*, *outspeak*, *outspend;* the adjectives *acclimate*, *acclivitous*, *appliant*, *communionable*, *educationable*, *hyperwrought*, *inerme*. *integrate*, *stereote;* and the verbs active *brunt*, *intergrain*, *metaphor*, *unmind*. And these he uses in prose.

"I have transgressed already. Two instances had been sufficient; as Noah preserved but two of all unclean creatures. The rest might be lost without losse, and safely be drowned in oblivion."[1]

"The studiers of our older literature", says William Taylor,[2] "must often have been led to observe, that words analogically formed, uncouth as they might at first appear, have, mostly, attained an eventual and lasting popularity; but that anomalous expressions, however welcome and current for a time, cannot be kept in circulation even by the efforts of writers the most deservedly valued." Rather, it should be said, of euphonious vocables which conform to analogy, and of those which transgress it, the former usually fare better than the latter, in obtaining permanent favour. Perhaps a quarter as many words as there are in Johnson's *Dictionary*, all of them duly analogical fabrications, were proposed during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, to perish almost as soon as they appeared; and Taylor himself

---

Dr. Newman, in his *Discussions and Arguments* (1872), p. 257, speaks of "*conventical* eloquence," meaning 'eloquence suited to a conventicle'. How does he get *conventicalis*, and not *conventicularis*, from *conventiculum*?

One of the latest creations of pretentious sciolism which I have noticed is *diamondiferous*, a term applied to certain tracts of country in South Africa. *Adamantiferous*, etymologically correct, would never answer; but all except pedants or affectationists would be satisfied with *diamond-producing*. *Civilizade* is a monster akin to *diamondiferous*. *Crescentade* may be, to many, self-explanatory; but one might almost be pardoned for supposing *civilizade* to be something to drink. To the multitude it must be as vaguely suggestive as *Sanskrit* was to the gentleman who hoped he was right in understanding it to be a species of alligator.

[1] *The Historie of the Holy Warre*, Book 5, Ch. 10.

[2] *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 11 (1801), p. 505.

was the patriarch of a numerous cognate brood, which have not survived their originator.[1] On the other hand, we have abundance of unanalogical mintages which custom has long sanctioned, and which we shall, in all likelihood, go on tolerating, albeit, as Bob Acres says of common oaths, "nothing but their antiquity makes them respectable."[2] They meet us, in fact, at every turn.

Scarcely more tolerable than words which offend against all analogy are those to understand which we are wantonly sent to travel beyond the limits of our extant vocabulary.

Lord Bolingbroke uses *artilize*;[3] but, in order to see what it means, we have to bethink ourselves that the Latins might, possibly, have made *artilis* from *ars*, as they made *gentilis* from *gens*.

Southey, with others[4] who have written since the days of the great French Revolution, makes mention of *philosophists* and *philosophism*;[5] and many, no

---

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 151, note [2].

[2] Did Sheridan steal this piece of wit? At all events, in a work which he was, no question, acquainted with, we read of "some harsh expressions . . . which are become venerable only by their antiquity." Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 2, p. 128.

[3] Florio, as quoted by Archdeacon Todd, has *artize*, which, for 'make artificial', is indefensible.

[4] *Philosophist.* Coleridge, *Literary Remains* (1836), Vol. 1, p. 298. Wordsworth, *Concerning the Relations*, &c. (1809), p. 174. *Philosophism.* Dr. Newman, *Loss and Gain* (ed. 1848), p. 65: *Lectures on the Scope and Nature of University Education* (ed. 1852), Preface, p. xxii.

[5] *Philosophist. Essays*, &c., Vol. 1, pp. 148, 323: *Colloquies*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 271. *Philosophism. Essays*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 185. *Philosophistical. Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 80: *Life of Wesley* (ed. 1864), Vol. 2, p. 191. The two first words were Anglicized from *philosophiste* and *philoso-*

doubt, have guessed amiss what is thereby intended.[1] On the whole, it would even be better to speak of *philosophasters* and *philosophastry*.

"The shadowy exhibition of a regal banquet in the desert draws out and stimulates the sense of its utter

---

phisme. The French have always applied them contemptuously; and so their English representatives have always been applied.

[1] The Greek Ἀττικίζω and the Latin *patrisso* belong to a class of words in which nothing disparaging is implied by their endings; and the ethical neutrality of our *philosophize* is quite regular. The French equivalent of our verb is *philosopher*.

In Greek, as σόφισμα and σοφιστὴς were derived from σοφίζω, the counterpart of a word like *philosophiser* should precede the counterparts of words like *philosophisme* and *philosophiste*. Whichever of their words the French devised first, they had no warrant from analogy, in giving them, as they gave them, invidious significations; for such they bear, as does *néologisme*, compared with *néologie*. Only a 'sham philosopher', a *philosophiste*,—or patron of 'false philosophy', *philosophisme*,—is said to *philosophiser*.

Dr. Webster, his editors, and Dr. Worcester, all err in taking *philosophism* from φίλος and σόφισμα; these persons not being aware that their composition is impossible. To arrive at φιλοσόφισμα, a derivative, we should have to assume φιλοσοφίζω; and the Greeks had no such verb. Further, as I have said already, we got our *philosophism* from *philosophisme*, which does not owe its detractive acceptation to its seeming connexion with *sophisme*. As between *philosophisme*, *philosophiste*, and *philosophiser*, to a Frenchman, the last, in contrast to his *philosopher*, is a key to the two first.

The lexicographers just named, starting with an unscholastic etymology, define *philosophism* by "love of fallacious arguments", "sophistry", &c. Southey and other well-informed writers certainly do not employ the term in that sense. However, since none but a French scholar will be likely to use it as the French use it, and since, etymologically, it has nothing to do with *sophism*, by reminding of which it is likely to mislead, it is just the sort of word to be avoided altogether. *Philosophism*, if we needed it, ought, with reference to *philosophize*,—which is as different from *philosophiser* as *poet* is from *poetaster*,—to be allied to *philosophy* and *philosopheme*. And so *philosophist* would signify 'philosopher'; as it does with Puttenham, in *The Arte of English Poesie*, p. 6. Compare *chirosophist*, for 'juggler', instead of which, Gaule might optionally have modified χειρόσοφος into *chirosopher*. See Πῦρ-μαντία, sig. l 4 r.

solitude and *remotion* from men and cities." So discourses Mr. De Quincey,[1] who, nevertheless, denounces Bentley's *putid* and *negoce* as "lawless pedantries", and as "filth".[2] Not only must *remotion* suggest, to the ordinary reader, 'repeated motion', or else 'backward motion', but, besides being neither actual English nor, it is to be hoped, potential, for 'removedness' or 'sequestration',[3] it is not even, in that sense, a true Latinism.[4]

Miss Cobbe writes of "having *constated* the peculiar doctrines of Christ."[5] The learned lady

---

[1] *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 321. The word *remotion* occurs also in Vol. 3, p. 183; and in Vol. 8, p. 62.

[2] *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 176. It is absurd thus to revile words without reference to their age. As to *putid*, it found acceptance with Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 191, 208; and with Cowley, *The Davideis* (ed. 1687), p. 28, where we read of "the *putid* officiousness of some grammarians." And Mr. De Quincey might easily have ascertained that the word is used by Henry More and Bp. Jeremy Taylor.

[3] The evidence of the Dictionaries does not affect this position. And their evidence I can supplement.

Mabbe writes: "fearing lest they might cause some *remotion* or alteration in her body." *The Rogue* (ed. 1623), Part 1, p. 19.

"In the second [Essay], he aggravates the sense of sorrow, the misery of this life, in respect of sin, the infelicity of it in her *remotion* from Sion." Richard Brathwait, *Essays upon the Five Senses* (1625), p. v. (in *Archaica*, Vol. 2).

"Salvation .... doth, in the Hebrew language, properly signifie a deliverance from, or *remotion* of, all sorts of inconvenience." Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 165. In this instance, *remotion* is *remotio*.

[4] Mr. De Quincey—see his *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 271, foot-note,—uses *symbology*. *Ideology* is bad enough; but this is worse. *Symbololagy* would be correct. *Symbologie* I have somewhere met with in French or German. The privilege of introducing, or countenancing, words of the stamp of *symbology*, should be restricted to professionals. *Vide supra*, p. 174, note [4].

[5] *Studies New and Old*, p. 9. Spenser in vain experimented with *renversed*, for 'turned upside down'; and Jeremy Collier would have Anglicized a modification of *renverser*, for 'overthrow'.

means 'ascertained'; but her Gallic *constate*, if construed at all, is sure to be construed, by any but a French scholar, into 'state with'.

In a passage quoted by Mr. Blackley,[1] we find Philistinism qualified as *deducated*, a term which the reverend gentleman is pleased to hold up for admiration. The word, we are considerately informed,

---

"But what do you think of those who appear in defence of immorality, endeavour to blast the credit of vertue, and *renverse* the notions of good and evil?" *Essays upon Several Moral Subjects* (ed. 1705), Part 3, pp. 50, 51. Also see p. 252 of the same Part, and Part 2, p. 11.

And compare Donne's *reenverse*. "And by such fiction, that English priest Bridgewater, which cals himselfe Aquipontanus, overturning and *re-enversing* his name with his conscience, may be beleeved, when he saies," &c. *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), p. 274.

If *rencounter* never fairly became English, there was still less hope for *renverse*.

Not much to their credit, English doctors and lawyers have tried to naturalize the French *viable*, 'likely to live', from *vie*, a corruption of *vita*. Who, at first sight, would not suppose that *viable* must be connected with *via*? *Vivable* would have been much better; or, if it were not dark enough, there is *vitable*, which does not lack the support of analogy. With the factitious *vivabilis* and *vitabilis* compare *stabilis* and *veniabilis*. The genuine Latin *vitabilis*, from *vito*, we have not thought fit to adopt.

"No produce ever maintains a consistent rate of *productibility*." Mr. John Ruskin, *Unto This Last*, p. 53, foot-note.

Why the politicaster's *productibility*? *Producible* does not mean *'productive'*; and, therefore, there is no call for the assumed adjective *productible*; though *productibilis* would be as regular as *divisibilis*. But the objection which I would here emphasize is, the liability of *productible* to be deemed an English formative,—like *merchantable*, *seasonable*, *serviceable*,—to signify 'suited for a product', or the like.

And just as bad is Mr. J. S. Mill's *irreductibility*. "But M. Comte's puerile predilection for prime numbers almost passes belief. His reason is, that they are the type of *irreductibility*: each of them is a kind of ultimate arithmetical fact." *Auguste Comte and Positivism*, p. 196.

[1] *Word Gossip*, p. 180.

signifies "misdirection of education."[1] To the proposer of *deducated* we owe, by the way, the felonious *imsons*, by which jargon he would designate words formed onomatopœically. The initiated are aware that this cryptograph is mangled Latin; but, to the outer world, it must seem to be, if not Patagonian, cabbalistic, and own brother to *abracadabra*, *abracalan*, and *shemhamphorash*.

And here it is obvious to remark, that a new word, if its relationship, as regards etymology and meaning, to one already free of the language, is at once perceptible, generally becomes English much faster than it would become so without those advantages.[2] Compare, with respect to the rapidity and degree of their naturalization, *analogue*, *custodian*, *envelope*, *grade*, *industrial*, *marine*, with *avuncular*, *calibre*, *campestrian*, *circensian*, *conciliar*, *connoisseur*, *dilettante*, *discipular*, *domical*, *improvise*, *lacustrine*, *lenticular*, *mirage*,[3] *profile*, *promenade*, *reconnoitre*, *riparian*, *route*, *spectacular*, *trait*.[4]

---

[1] It would not be more than half as bad to coin *redit*, to mean 'give out again,' 'edit over.'

[2] One is not surprised that *superchery* and *surquedry* never became firmly rooted in the language.

[3] Mr. J. G. Whittier has, in his *Snow-bound*:

"The *mirage* loomed across her way."

Here the scansion requires that we pronounce the word as a trochee. It is noticeable, that Americans are more prone than Englishmen to confer on foreign words the full rights of naturalization at once, rather than by degrees.

[4] There is much to commend in the spirit of Southey's views, as to taking terms from abroad, and as to the way we should use them, when we have taken them.

"I have no objection to Anglicize a word from any language, when *we have no* equivalent for it, and would, therefore, write *managery and naivety; but I* have a very great objection to see written English

In the third place, a new word should be euphonious. And the inbred feeling of us who use English is,

interlarded with foreign phrases." *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, Vol. 3, p. 333.

Consonantly to his principles, Southey wrote *millionist*, instead of *millionaire*, our misspelling of the French *millionnaire*. *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 45 (1831), p. 429. How he must have nauseated Coleridge's *potenziate!*

Landor makes Horne Tooke say: "If we must use such words as *reverie*, why not oblige them to conform with their predecessors, *travesty* and *gaiety*, which should have the *y* instead of the *i*? When we, following Cowley, write *pindarique*, we are laughed at; but nobody laughs at *picturesque* and *antique*, which are equally reducible to order." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 154.

The latter sentence of this passage is based on no principle whatever.

Glanvill, in his *Scepsis Scientifica*, p. 159, has *encyclopædy*. Coleridge and Mr. De Quincey write *dyspepsy*.

Akin to the ambition which actuates such spellings is that which would lessen our dependence, as to words, on foreign languages. Puttenham, at p. 191, tells us that "Master Secretary Wilson" proposed *wit-craft*, for *logic*. Verstegan puts *foolish-fire*, instead of *ignis fatuus*. William Taylor suggested *speech-lore*, as a substitute for *philology*. *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 13 (1802), p. 13. Less happy is his *linguacious*, to serve the purpose of *linguistic*. *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 73 (1814), p. 499. And less happy still is his *body-spirit*, for those who object to *esprit de corps*. *Ibid.*, Vol. 13 (1794), p. 39.

The following passage is by Thomas Edwards, author of *The Canons of Criticism*, a work which was long, and not undeservedly, popular.

"I am not for borrowing of the French any words which we can fairly derive from the Latin, or from our own stock; for which reason, I write *honor*, *superior*, &c.,—without taking any notice of the French termination *-eur*,—and *governer*, as we form *defender*." *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, Vol. 3, p. 63.

Edwards is speaking of the forms of our words; and he thus intimates rules which, from first to last, have been largely, but most capriciously, applied; the first, to the effect of assimilating the Latinistic vocables of our language to their ancient originals, and the second, to the effect of methodizing our spelling after English analogies. At present, the genealogy of our words, as deducible from their appearance, only realizes extreme confusion; and we shall do wisely, if, instead of discontinuing the reformation which has been carried so far, we go on and complete it. It is not probable that we shall ever

that a word should not be very long,[1] any more than very harsh.[2] Hence our shortenings, in utter ance, of *Michilimackinac* and *Winnipiseogee*, and the British contractions of *Auchinleck*, *Beauchamp*, *Cavendish*, *Cholmondeley*, *Cirencester*, *Colquhoun*, *Leveson*, *Majoribanks*, and *Pontefract*.[3] Much as we might require an

get back to *superiour*, or to *governour*. When the latter was given up, its successor should have been *governer*, as we substituted *defender* for *defendour*; *govern* and *defend* being our verbs. So Dr. Johnson writes *visiter*, in the place of the old *visitour*.

Everybody writes *effigy*, *eulogy*, *lancet*, *parley*, *volley*; and why should we consent to write *programme* and *toilette*?

Collaborateur is an excellent word, which neither 'co-labourer' nor 'fellow-workman' defines adequately. Many have felt the need of it; but the right form, for us, is *collaborator*.

Literator, modified from *littérateur*, is much nearer being Anglicized. This word, but not in the sense attached to it by Burke, we have long desiderated; and the countenance it has received from Southey, Landor, Lockhart, Mr. De Quincey, and Mr. Carlyle, has already availed to take off something of its strangeness of aspect. The singular of *literati* has had but few favourers; the substantive *literate* is preoccupied; and *literato*, used by Hughes, in *The Spectator*, No. 53, and by Cowper,—see his *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 266,—never had the least prospect of being adopted. Considering how little we tie ourselves to the limits imposed on words by classical usage,—as witness our *civil*, *consul*, and *pagan*,—it is nothing if we make our *literators* commensurate with the Roman *literati*.

[1] *Facilitate* we have no scruples about; but *difficilitate* has knocked for admittance, without being listened to. Nor, for their length, can we readily endure Southey's revivals, *possibilitate* and *impossibilitate*. See *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 39 (1829), p. 134; and *Selections from the Letters*, &c., Vol. 4, p. 168. Coleridge has *impossibilification*.

[2] Notions of euphony are not the same all the world over. I once asked a Pandit, a professor of poetry, what he considered to be the most melodious word in Sanskrit. His reply was *slakshna*. And he was not jesting.

[3] The reduction of *Brighthelmstone* to *Brighton* is attributed to George IV. My English home, *Marlesford*, is vulgarly called *Malsa*; and, among the neighbouring parishes, *Bergholt*, *Brandeston*, *Charsfield*, *Hacheston*, *Sudborne*, and *Thrandeston* are known, by the common people, as *Barfle*, *Branston*, *Charfle*, *Hayson*, *Subbon*, and *Transon*.

adjective of *appendix*, as *appendical*, there would have been no chance for Bentham's *appendixious*,[1] or for William Taylor's *appendicatory*,[2] even if they had been formed agreeably to analogy. Doubtless, it was, in many cases, chiefly owing to their cumbrousness, that so many of our early English compounds and derivatives were superseded by substitutes from the Latin. Numerous are the words like *amatorious*, *arbitrarious*, *curtal*,[3] *magistratical*,[4] *obscenous*, *opacous*,

---

[1] See Bentham's *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 236. Having to do with an uncorrupted Latin word, Bentham should have started with *appendic-*, for his base. *Appendicious* would, in form, resemble *judicious*,—if *judicious* were from *judex*, instead of *judicium*;—but its *-ous*, as most generally answering to *-osus*, would still be out of place. The analogy of *varicose*, from *varix*, would yield *appendicose*, which, too, represents *-osus*. The force of *-osus*, *-ous*, is often misunderstood. Mr. Isaac Taylor, not satisfied with the existing *acclivous*, uses *acclivitous*, which, since it is not intended to mean 'abounding in acclivities', is worse than a mere superfluity.

[2] *The Annual Review*, Vol. 6 (1808), p. 234. *Judicatorius* does not come directly from *judex*; and *appendicatory* would demand some word intermediate to itself and *appendix*, as *appendicator*.

[3] I mean the adjective; and this I would refer, differently from Dr. Webster's editors, to *curtalis*, a factitious elongation of *curtus*. Further, from our old adjective, perhaps, originated the verb now written *curtail*. To explain *curtail* by a concretion of *curt tailler* seems to me worse than far-fetched. For when was *curt tailler* ever used for *tailler court*? Our old verb was *curtall*. See Thomas Campion (1602), in *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 165: Thomas James, *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture*, &c. (1612), Part 2, p. 59: Heylin, *Ecclesia Vindicata* (1657), Part 1, p. 132.

The adjective *curtal* is older than Milton. "In fruit-time, we had some soure cherries, three sowre plummes, one or two little apricocks, halfe a pound of figges, and now and then a whole pound, according to the number of those that sate at table, but in that minced and *curtall* manner, that there was none of us so nimble-finger'd that wee could come to vye it the second time." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (ed. 1623), Part 2, p. 274.

In *curtal-axe*, we have a mere corruption of *coutelas*, *cutlass*.

[4] For this word, see Burthogge, *Causa Dei* (1675), p. 136. And it

orthodoxal, prolixious, proportionable,[1] and *robustious,* which we have exchanged for fewer syllables. Who, if he can help it, will use *cardinalitial, castrensian,* or *litaneutical?* Or who will now write *aristocratical, characteristical, erratical? Consolate, convocate, denotate, destinate,*[2] *determinate, excitate, exhalate, exultate, impedite,*[3] *modificate, occasionate, ruinate,* and *specificate* have gone the way of *cavillation, contentation, designment, disguisement, projectment,* and *visitment. Circumforaneous* beggars have disappeared along with *stercoraceous* breezes, *subventaneous* eggs, and things *antecedaneous* and *supervacaneous.* The old-fashioned *tritical* are now only *trite; voluntaries* have given place to *volunteers; atrabilarious penitentiaries* are, in our time, less miserable, by four syllables, than they used to be; *elegiographers, historiographers,* and *referendaries* have shrunk into *elegists, historians,* and *referees;* and *valetudinarians*[4] are fast succumbing before *invalids.*[5] No doubt, too, we should have had,

---

is used by Godwin, in *An Enquiry,* &c. (ed. 1793), p. 788. Mr. Jodrell quotes Mrs. Macaulay for it.

[1] Mr. De Quincey is, for a modern, rather peculiar, in his preference for *proportionable* to *proportional.*

[2] Before *injure* seems to have got into vogue, I find *injury* used as a verb. Lyly, *Euphues* (1579-80), p. 460 (ed. 1868). So the verb *desting* apparently preceded *destine.* Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame* (1592), p. 58 (ed. 1841): Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, p. 346. Compare *philosophy,* the verb, as preceding *philosophize.* Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), p. 343; *Biathanatos,* p. 46. Barrow tried *philosophate. Works,* Vol. 1, p. 173. And so did Urquhart and others.

[3] Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, pp. 112, 142.

[4] It is odd that *valetudo,*—whence *valetudinarius,*—at first the analogue of our now indifferent *health,* should have come, even in Cicero's time, to mean 'illness'.

[5] We have kept *hospitality,*—though its base has disappeared,—in preference to coining the cumbrous *hospitability.* For the adjective

as stable contributions to our vocabulary, *alt*,[1] *cit*, *plenipo*, *pos*, and *vet*, if there had been as popular a demand for the apocopation of *altitudes*, *citizen*, *plenipotentiary*, *positive*, and *veterinarian*,[2] as there was for docking *cabriolet*, *incognito*, and *mobile*, and for beheading *easterling* and *Oporto*.[3]

Moreover, our aversion to dissonance has often proved to be stronger than our care for analogy.[4]

---

hospital, see Philemon Holland, *Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 121 : Fuller, *The Appeal*, &c. (1659), Part 2, p. 95.

[1] In the next chapter I speak of this abbreviation.

[2] The Romans themselves would not abide what was, probably, the full form, *veheterinarius*. *Latrina*, in like manner, was reduced from *lavatrina*.

[3] Whence *sterling* and *port*,—the wine.

[4] A striking illustration of this is seen where, in order to obtain certain feminine substantives from masculines, we add a termination, instead of substituting one. *Hostess*, *poetess*, *shepherdess*, &c., we have no feeling against,—and Chapman, Milton, and Dryden had none against *heroess;* Fuller, none against *patriarchess;* and Richardson, none against *rivaless*, — their masculine bases having immovable terminations. Again, as to *archeress*, *archress* would have outraged euphony; or else we should have had it; as we have *arbitress*, *foundress*, *tigress:* and I have collected instances of *butleress*, *danceress*, *ostleress*, *reformeress*, *revengeress*, and *usurperess;* with *cateress*, *chantress*, *comfortress*, *commandress*, *embroideress*, *harbouress*, *inventress*, *ministress*, *philosophess*, *portress*, *tormentress*, *visitress*, &c. &c. As modified from words in *-or*, I have met with *conductress*, *conqueress*, *directress*, *doctress*, *oratress*, *preceptress*, *spectatress*, &c. &c. But it is very different, when we annex *-ess* to *-or*. *Tutoress*, like *tutress*, has been in print; but neither word has taken root. To *electoress* and *traitoress*, which occur here and there, we generally prefer *electress* and *traitress;* and we never say *actoress*, but *actress*. Thomas Nash has *rectoress;* but Ben Jonson, *rectress;* Miss Carter and Mr. Charles Kingsley, *professoress*. *Mayoress* and *prioress* there is no help for. *Authoress* remains. A separate substantive bearing its signification seems to be now indispensable; though we are still satisfied with female *sponsors*. And here, as in *mayoress* and *prioress*, we must put up with an anomaly, unless we accord our favour to *authress*. This harsh expression—with which contrast Brathwait's *instructess*, in *The English Gentleman*, &c., p. 43,—is used by James Hayward, in The Banish'd

Our adverbs matching adjectives in *-ble* end in *-bly*, —as *ably*, not *ablely*,—to form which we compressed *-blely* into one syllable. *Holily*, *jollily*, *lowlily*, *sillily*, and the like, we barely endure; we have given up *idlely*;[1] and we will have nothing to do with the equally regular *dailily*, *hourlily*, *monthlily*, *weeklily*, *yearlily*, and a great number of similar formations. In preference to using them, we make the adverbs the same as the adjectives.[2] *Futurely*, *tally*, and *smally*, once common, we revolt at,[3] substituting periphrases therefor; and *contrarily* has almost been driven out by *contrariwise*. Long adverbs of the comparative and superlative degrees, as *fiercelier* and *wiseliest*, once very frequent both in prose and in verse, have gone out of vogue,—chiefly because some of them

---

Virgin (1635), p. 187; and Dr. Johnson quotes Fanshawe for it. *Authoress*, I scarcely need remark, is no novelty.

We are told, by Fuller, of Queen Elizabeth: "She could not well digest the affected over-eleganey of such as prayed for her by the title of '*Defendress* of the Faith', and not the '*Defender*'." *The Holy State*, &c., p. 296.

What, then, could Queen Bess have thought of the pious topographer, John Norden, who taught his generation to pray for her as "our soveraigne Lady and *Governes*"! See *A Pensive Mans Practise* (1584), fol. 6 r.

[1] It was of frequent occurrence down to 1650, and, no doubt, later. Sir Thomas Elyot has *idelly*.

Lamentablely is used by John Norden, in *A Sinfull Mans Solace* (ed. 1585), fol. 13 v.

[2] The once common adverbs *fatherly*, *friendly*, *godly*, *lively*, *motherly*, *orderly*, &c., formally identical with adjectives, have gone out of use; and we now say *in a fatherly way*, &c.

Headlongly has the authority of Donne, Mabbe, &c. Latimer, Puttenham, and many others have *alonely*. With these adverbs have disappeared *angerly*, *hungerly*, *unexpeetly*, *wishly*, &c. &c.

[3] Yet we do not object to *solely*. For *foully*, *subtilely*, and *wholly*, *we often find*, in old books, *fouly*, *subtily*, and *wholy*. And they have *soly*. *See*, for other such contractions, note [4] in the next page.

offend the ear,—to such a degree as now to be accounted, with an exception or two,[1] if not affected, poetic licences; and the congeners of *blesseder*, *lyingest*,[2] and *belovedest*,[3] which were none too harsh for our forefathers,[4] are now all but universally banished. Nor do we stop here. The idea conveyed by *difficultly* is one which we constantly have occasion to express; and yet this word, though it must, for centuries, have occurred to almost every one that has written or spoken English, and though it must have been printed hundreds of times, can hardly be said to belong to our language.[5] Its fortunes would

[1] *Earlier* and *earliest* are among the most familiar.

[2] Shakespeare has this word. Dekker has *weather-beatenest*. See *A Knights Conjuring* (1607), p. 23 (ed. 1842).

[3] Words of this stamp are very generally shunned by our contemporaries. An exception is seen in that phenomenon of civilization and humanity, Mr. Thomas Carlyle.

[4] And yet they rebelled at *profaneness* and *proneness*, instead of which we find, in many a book of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in contempt of etymological considerations, *profaness* and *proness*. *Finesse*, for *fineness*, once was extremely common; and I have found *superfinesse* and *divinesse*. Ben Jonson has, in verse, *exampless* for *exampleless*; Beaumont and Fletcher, *paralleless* for *parallelless*; and *famoust*, for *famousest*, was allowed for metre. Instances, in old books, of *conging* courtiers, *curring* favour, *tarring* one's pleasure, and *usuring* Jews, are not infrequent. *Mutining* was not entirely abolished a hundred years ago.

[5] Here follow a few references for *difficultly*. Raphe Robynson, Translation of *Utopia* (1551), p. 99 (ed. 1869). John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification*, &c. (1642), To the Reader. *The Naturall and Experimentall History of Winds*, &c. (1653), pp. 212, 351. Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (ed. 1656), pp. 1, 253. Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (1665), pp. 5, 80: *Scire Tuum Nihil Est* (1665), pp. 15, 27, 28, &c.: *Essays*, &c. (1676), II., p. 46. Barrow, *Works* (ed. 1683-92), Vol. 1, p. 7. Otway, *The Cheats of Scapin* (1677), Act 2, Scene 1. Jeremy Collier, *Essays upon Several Moral Subjects*, Part 1 (ed. 1703), p. 204; Part 2 (ed. 1702), pp. 136, 166; Part 3 (ed. 1705), p. 141; Part 4 (ed. 1725), p. 177. Bentley, *Works*,

have been very different, had it been as smooth to the tongue as the Italian *difficilmente*, or the French *difficilement*,[1] or our old *uneath*.

Vol. 2, p. 31. Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 171. Fielding, *The Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great*, Preface. Dr. Johnson, *Life of the King of Prussia: The False Alarm* (1770): *Letter to Mrs. Thrale*, Sept. 30, 1773. Bishop Hurd, *Moral and Political Dialogues* (ed. 1760), p. 189. Cowper, *The Connoisseur*, No. 138. Southey, *The Annual Review*, Vol. 3 (1805), p. 622: *Colloquies*, &c. (ed. 1831), Vol. 2, pp. 117, 311: *The Doctor* (monotome ed.), p. 594. And Goldsmith has the word somewhere in his *Animated Nature*.

Some of my readers may wonder why I thus heap up references. Well, sometimes it is for one reason, and sometimes it is for another. Take the very word just despatched. Not long ago, on my speaking of it, in conversation with a very learned scholar, in much the same terms that I have employed in the text, my collocutor very positively queried its ever having got into print. Yet very likely he had seen it dozens of times.

Memory is a poor thing, at best; and alas for the man that puts his trust in it! In my *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*, I have used the expression *to happen on* something. One of my English critics, on seeing this, pounced upon me with indignation, and lectured me severely for presuming to write about English, while still capable of so disgusting an Americanism. My friends in the United States will know whether the expression be used there: I, for my part, do not know, having quite forgotten. But what I do know is, that I hear it used in East Anglia, by the people about me, every day; and I have chanced on it in a good variety of books of different ages. Of these I name a few, with their authors. Sir Thomas More, *Apologye* (1533), fol. 5. Harvey, *Pierce's Supererogation*, p. 186. Henry Porter, *The Two Angry Women*, &c., p. 91. Camden, *Remains* (ed. 1674), p. 41. Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (1613), in *The Somers Tracts* (2nd ed.), Vol. 3, p. 592. Brathwait, *The Lives of All the Roman Emperors*, p. 184. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Romulus and Tarquin* (1637), p. 289. *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 4, p. 20. Heylin, *A Full Relation*, &c. (1656), p. 265. Milton, *Prose Works* (Bohn's ed.), Vol. 5, p. 180. Translation of *Il Cardinalismo*, &c. (1670), p. 257. Alexander Pope, *The Guardian*, No. 4. De Foe, *Captain Singleton* (ed. 1840), p. 327. Southey, *The Doctor* (1-vol. ed.), p. 621. *Happen into*. Dryden, *An Evening's Love*, Ep. Ded. Mrs. Centlivre, *The Busybody*, Act 1, Scene 1. *Ignoramus*, Act 5.

[1] The adjective *partial*, as denoting contrast with *totality*, has long *had common vogue*; but the occurrence of its adverb has greatly in-

Many are the words which, though nine persons out of every ten use them, are positive blemishes to

---

creased within the last hundred years. *Partially*, for 'not totally', 'only in part', was, in some connexions, good English to Sir Thomas Browne; and, from the educated sense of euphony which distinguishes modern ears, it has been well-nigh completely resuscitated. There are cases in which *partly*, if substituted for it, would affect many persons of nice perceptions much after the manner of a wrong note in music. Let the reader test the tenableness of this notion by the annexed extracts.

"But, secondly, *partially* as we may, or perhaps must, comprehend this subject, in common with all subjects which relate strictly and solely to the nature of our future life," &c. Paley, *Sermon* 18.

"The second [assertion] imputes the evil to a cause in itself inevitable, and which has only incidentally and *partially* operated in producing it." Southey, *Essays Moral and Political*, Vol. 1, p. 331.

"The inward principle develops in some degree, but *partially* and unequally; issuing in an inconsistent, or inchoate, or badly proportioned, creed and polity." Dr. Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. 1, p. 334.

"Shakespeare did perfectly what Æschylus did *partially*." Mr. Ruskin, *Lectures on Architecture and Painting*, p. 181.

A few references here follow. Miss Burney, *Cecilia* (1782), Book 1, Ch. 1; Book 8, Ch. 1. Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., pp. 21, 53, 207, 267. Charles Lamb, *Letters*, Vol. 2, p. 263. Dr. Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History* (ed. 1845), pp. 29, 36, 183. Dr. John Bruce, *Haywarde's Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 41, foot-note. Landor, *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, pp. 142, 284. Mr. De Quincey, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 69; Vol. 16, p. 163. Dr. Newman, *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles*, p. 34: *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, pp. 91, 413: *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. 1, pp. 11, 34, 35; Vol. 2, p. 192: *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects*, pp. 147, 273. Mr. John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, p. 35: *Unto This Last* (1862), p. 165: *The Queen of the Air* (1869), pp. 95, 175: *Fors Clavigera*, Letter 2, p. 11; Letter 10, p. 16; Letter 14, p. 20; Letter 23, p. 1: *Sesame and Lilies* (ed. 1871), pp. 8, 90: *Munera Pulveris* (ed. 1872), pp. 53, 115: *The Eagle's Nest* (1872), pp. 23, 175: *Time and Tide* (ed. 1872), p. 33.

"*Partially* is often used, and by educated people, for *partly*. Even Mr. Swinburne says, in his interesting, but somewhat strained and overwrought, book on William Blake: 'If this view of the poem be wholly or *partially* correct.' But *partially*, the adverb of *partial*, means 'with unjust or unreasonable bias'. A view cannot be both

our tongue. Old or new, if not ineradicably established, or if not exchangeable for others that comport with analogy, and are just as intelligible and euphonious, we should give them the go-by. To learn what to avoid, a heedful study of the best writers is, though not all in all, indispensable, and will continue to be so, pending the appearance of lexicographers much in advance of those who have hitherto volunteered to enlighten us. As to choice of words, new or old, while, among writers of the first class, none are wild neoterists, there are conservatives of every degree of conservatism. Of these, some set their faces, regardless of expedience, against everything

---

correct and *partial*. When anything is done *in part*, it is *partly*, not *partially*, done. Both words are from one root; but to confuse the two is to deprive us of the use of one." Mr. R. G. White, *Words and their Uses*, p. 143.

On the one hand, we have the historical fact, known to everybody, that *partial* signifies not only 'prejudiced', but 'not total', &c., as when we speak of 'a *partial* eclipse of the moon'; and, on the other hand, we have Mr. White's implied denial of this fact. Further, Mr. White analyses "*partially* correct", as applied to a view, into "*correct* and *partial*". By his peculiar logic, his own view, in the present instance, if '*wholly* wrong', is '*wrong* and *whole*'. As to the danger of confusion from the multivocalness of *partial* and *partially*, it is, ordinarily, about as great as that which attaches to *fast*, when we say 'he stands *fast*' and 'he runs *fast*.'

Nothing could be more whimsical and artificial than the notions of euphony inculcated by Landor; as witness his rule about *has* and *hath*. Again, he makes Johnson say: "I do not willingly write *re-establish* or *re-edify*. The better word for the one would be *restablish*, if *restore* and *refix* are inadequate; and, for the other, *reconstruct*. It is bad enough to be affected; but it is intolerable to be at once affected and uncouth." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 159.

I find, however, that Johnson writes: "Cape Breton, therefore, was restored; and the French were *re-established* in America, with equal power and greater spirit, having lost nothing, by the war, which they had before gained." *Observations on the State of Affairs in MDCCLVI., ad finem.*

in the least novel; but others, more wisely, conform, in their phraseology, to the temper of the times. Popularity, however, or even celebrity, is no guaranty of skill in neoterizing, with reference to need, analogicalness, or harmony.[1] From the best writers

---

[1] Mr. Richard Grant White, in the new edition of his *Words and Their Uses*, has a fresh chapter, entitled *Jus et Norma Loquendi*. And there I find, regarding several expressions of recent appearance, arguments and judgments which I cannot but decline.

As to Mr. J. R. Lowell's *undisprivacied*, we read: "It is English, because its meaning is clear, and its formation normal. Its meaning is 'has not been robbed of privacy'; and it is as correctly formed as *undisturbed*." But, if it be clear, why stop to define it? Further: "No man who felt in him any mastery of language would be likely to hesitate a moment over such a word." The meaning, as the context explains, is 'hesitate to use the word.' But a word, to be thoroughly acceptable, should provoke no more demur, on the part of others, than is felt by its author or adopter. A long exposition of the process by which the illuminated rise from *privacy* to *undisprivacied* follows; though, if the latter be sufficiently self-explanatory to justify itself, the illuminated should have no advantage whatever, as regards it, over the unilluminated; and, finally, any one who doubts about the matter is relegated to the regions of natural stupidity, by the cruel verdict: "All this comes at once, by intuition, to men who are masterful in language, or ready and true in its apprehension." It is not inspiriting to see an instructor on so very lofty a pedestal.

Acutely conscious what commiserable objects I consent to be ranked with, for my hesitation at *undisprivacied*, I do not only hesitate at it, but protest against it, explicitly and emphatically. The question before us is, in the main, yet by no means altogether, a question of taste; and such is my instinct, blunt or otherwise, that I venture to challenge ninety and nine out of any hundred Englishmen, to avow, as concerns *undisprivacied*, their concurrence with me. Nor do I doubt, for a moment, that Mr. White, if he had met with the word in the pages of any writer whom he did not particularly fancy, would have held it up, and out at the very finger's end of pure and polished taste, for indignation and abhorrence.

"A finer example of the introduction of a sound, good, new, and purely English word could not be found than in the following passage: . . . . 'Again, to a starving person we would first administer, homœopathically, *such small* quantities of food as would enhunger, if not

we may, with proper care, gather ideas of the multiform considerations which control the right selection

---

almost starve, a hearty person'. . . . *Enhunger* . . . has as robust an English constitution as any word in the Bible or in Shakespeare."

With respect to its construction, *enhunger* must be referred to *en* and the verb active *hunger*, which has long been obsolete. Regularly, too, an *en-* verb of Anglo-Saxon base should terminate in *-en;* and *en* + *hyngran* would yield *enhungern*, with which compare *enhearten*, *enlighten*. And what would *enhungern*, *enhunger*, or *behunger* signify, analogically? Why, 'sharpen hunger', 'make hungry', for which we already have *appetize*. Hence it is superfluous. To denote, as it denotes in the passage quoted, 'leave hungry,' it is simply a barbarism. *Starve*, as there used, in "*starve* a hearty person", for 'leave starved', is, also, a barbarism; and "*would* first administer," for 'should', &c., is still another barbarism. Mr. White is unfortunate in the neoterisms and neoterists selected by him for commendation.

Resurrectionized, he tells us, "is bad enough; worse, if possible, than its forerunner, *resurrected*." Both these words I have treated of in my *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*, p. 73, note 1, and have shown, that, however one may dislike them, they are legitimate formations. As to *resurrectionize*, we make substantives in *-ist*, as we want them, and from all manner of bases; and, though they ought, by a classical rule of evolution, to be preceded by verbs in *-ize*, when we have once got them, or even substantives in *-ism*, or of other terminations, inverting this rule, we freely develop such verbs out of them. Hence, from *resurrectionist*, *resurrectionize*. Similarly, we have the old *melancholize*, used by Coleridge; *physiognomize*, used by Southey; *colloquize*, used by Southey and Miss Charlotte Brontë; Mr. De Quincey's *ventriloquize;* Mr. Isaac Taylor's *religionize;* Mr. Charles Kingsley's *misanthropize;* and the *diplomatize*, *excursionize*, *optimize*, and *pessimize* of *The Saturday Review*. If it be contended, that *resurrectionize* was formed from *resurrection*, without the historical intervention of *resurrectionist*, parallels to it offer in Coleridge's *objectionize*, and in *The Saturday Review's fractionize* and *processionize*. Substantives of other endings than *-ist* and *-ion* have served as bases of *annalize*, *antistrophize*, *balladize*, *biographize*, *canalize*, *capitalize*, *censorize*, *churchwardenize*, *concubinize*, *conservatize*, *cottonize*, *democratize*, *dissenterize*, *energize*, *formularize*, *formulize*, *hybridize*, *monotonize*, *objectize*, *pauperize*, *pedantize*, *phantomize*, *pulpitize*, *sensize*, *skeletonize*, *sororize*, *sultanize*, *summarize*, *testimonialize*, *typographize*, for every one of which verbs I could furnish respectable authority. Mr. *White writes, too,* as if quite certain that *resurrectionize* is of later *birth than resurrect*. On what grounds? Southey used *resurrection-*

of expressions more or less familiar to us. Words and meanings actually new to us stand, as regards

---

ize as long ago as 1804. See the *Selections* from his letters, Vol. 1, p. 270.

"And what are the *misnomered* Republicans doing, but seeking to perpetuate, in the Southern States, the social nuisance of class-distinctions?" Having copied this passage from some unnamed newspaper, which, for its philological sins, is branded with the same epithet that it gives to "class-distinctions", Mr. White puts on his terrible black cap, and proceeds to pass sentence on *misnomered*, as being "an execrable compound" and a "hideous verb." Nay, forgetful of due judicial impassivity, he waxes emotional, and screams, in a paroxysm of agony: "By what process did a man who has been able to command the right to use a pen in the leading columns of a first-rate journal, reach that depth of degradation in language, compared to which cant is classical, and slang elegant?" Be the process what it may, the critic seems to have had personal experience of something very like it, baffling as he finds its analysis.

Misnomered, as I shall show, is not entirely a horror; and, as to age, our very great-grandparents knew it, as witness Richardson's *Pamela* (ed. 1811), Vol. 4, p. 121.

To champion *misnomered* is not in the least my intention. And yet, seeing that life obtrudes upon us so many real provocatives of righteous wrath, it is hardly a thing to rave about, and shriek at, after Mr. White's fashion. The word is not wanted; and there, summarily, is an end. As to make, it is absolutely faultless. From some ancient substantive for *name* was derived an ancient verb for *name;* and, from the latter, the verb *misname*, which we have not chosen to turn into a popular substantive. The substantive *misnomer* was dealt with, by the author of *misnomered*, exactly as some one, ages ago, dealt with an ancestor of the substantive *name;* and, in creating his nominal verb, he did as, towards enriching our language, we do constantly. He also seems to have preferred a fuller-bodied word than *misnamed*, — just as Mr. White, in his new chapter, prefers *impecuniosity* to *poverty;*—and, under the impulse of taste about on the level of our castigator's, he realized his option.

Mr. White's summing up is as follows: "Now again it is to be observed, that *resurrectionized* and *misnomered* are not outcasts because they lack the sanction of usage, or the authority of eminent writers. They are no newer, nor less sanctioned by use, good or bad, rude or cultured, than *undisprivacied*, or *streeted*, or *enhungered;* no stranger, to the common ear, than *weaponed*. But the latter are sound and healthy growths; the former are fungi, monstrous and pestilent."

their eligibility, on an independent basis. Those which are eligible must, without reservation, supply

---

A writer must be enviably confident of his own perceptive inerrancy, thus to set up, with scornful air and cathedral dogmatism, his individual aversion and approbation, as criteria for the decisions of his fellow-beings. And suppose that a man honestly finds it impossible to like and to dislike conformably with the ukases of a self-elected autocrat: what then? With beautiful consistency, he is pitilessly admonished of his presumptuousness, should he think of counting himself among those who feel in them "any mastery of language."

After a few more words, I shall drop Mr. White for the present. From *The Knight's Tale* he quotes, in his new chapter, the expression "*bothe* heven and erthe and see", and then says: "Now, for such a use of *both*, the 'authority', that is, the example, of Chaucer can be of no more weight than that of an anonymous advertisement in a newspaper. Etymology and usage, including that of Chaucer himself in other passages, make the meaning of *both* 'two taken together'; and it is impossible that the same word can mean 'two' and 'three'. If fifty passages could be produced from the works of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, in which *both* was applied to three objects, such a use of it by others might be excused, but it could not be justified. The case is extreme, but, therefore, of value: it brings the point out sharply; and by such examples a point to be established has its best illustration. And there it is; *both*, used by one of our greatest poets, to mean 'three taken together'."

This comment, I submit, betrays an absence of the most ordinary degree of acumen. For its fundamental error consists in confounding the conjunction *both* with the pronoun *both*; words as different, in nature, as *et* and *ambo*. In 'Paul and Peter and Philip were *both* there', which nobody says, *both* (*ambo*) is made to mean 'three'; but not so in '*Both* (*et*) Paul and Peter and Philip were there'. '*Both* Paul, Peter, and Philip', though the comma after 'Paul' is a substitute for *and*, is objectionable, because little supported by usage. Just such an expression I find fault with in Dr. Johnson. See p. 200.

Nor are parallels wanting subversive of the principle on which Mr. White asserts it to be "impossible that the same word can mean 'two' and 'three'." *Any* and *none*, which, by virtue of their parentage from *an* and *ne ân*, 'one' and 'not one', originally required a singular verb, have long been allowed to take a plural verb. "If *any* of you lack wisdom, let *him* ask of God." "*None are* to be had." The first expression is obsolete; the second, in comparison of origin, is modern. *Any* having lost its exclusively singular denotation, we should now *say* '*If any one* of you', &c., which, in old English, would be

desiderata; and, while doing so, they must fulfil the conditions which it is reasonable to impose on desiderata. We live in days when our language is the subject of daily and daring innovations. Revolutionism in all things is, indeed, the spirit of our age; and this chapter will not have been written in vain, if it shall but serve as a contribution, however meagre, towards teaching the art, in the domain of speech, of revolutionizing after precedent.

---

pleonastic. To a slightly different purport, we also say: 'If *any* of you lack wisdom, let *them* ask of God', which was not old English. And we say, also, *any man* and *any men*. *Any*, originally intending a single person, has, thus, come to be a substitute for an indefinite plurality of persons, as well. Over and above usage we have, therefore, analogy, in support of "*bothe* heven and erthe and see", and of Coleridge's

"He prayeth well, who loveth well
Both man and bird and beast."

Our forefathers thought good to extend the use of the conjunction *both*, while they left the use of the pronoun *both*, from which it sprang, unextended. But the conjunction has undergone no extension, as concerns its sense and essential function. Unaided, it never even coupled; but, as it may help to connect two things, so it may help to aggregate a dozen. It is *both* with *and* that joins two things; and, if a third thing is to be added, how can the leashing be effected better than by another *and*? *Either*, *whether*, and *neither*, the conjunctions, contribute, in like manner to *both*, but yet only contribute, to the linking into a group any number of constituents. And they, too, came from pronouns which do not contemplate more than a duality.

Mr. White, in a letter to *The New York Times* of June 7, 1873, writes: "I have observed only two instances of the use of *both* in reference to three individuals." Why, there is "*Both* mongrel, puppy, whelp, and hound," &c., in Goldsmith's famous elegy; and there is "*both* my duetie and name and propretie," in Udall's *Ralph Roister Doister*, Act 5, Sc. 1. "Only two instances" of *both . . and . . and . .* ! Who that knows English critically can doubt that our approved authors, if searched, would yield two thousand instances?

The second edition of Mr. White's book did not reach me till just as I was sending my sixth chapter to the press. Otherwise, I should, in earlier pages of this volume, have noticed some of its contents.

CHAPTER VII.

OUR GRANDFATHERS' ENGLISH.

Ut silvæ foliis pronos mutantur in annos,
Prima cadunt, ita verborum vetus interit ætas,
Et, juvenum ritu, florent modo nata vigentque.

Horace.

In order to exact ideas of current English, it is necessary to take account, as of the late accessions to it, so, and primarily, of its defalcations from the speech of our recent predecessors. If, as Mr. Marsh most unaccountably asserts,[1] "scarcely a word that Johnson[2] and his contemporaries would have used has

---

[1] *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 127.

[2] Johnson I shall not often quote in the ensuing pages, and for the reason, that, though his imitators were numerous, far from being characteristic, as a writer, of the age in which he lived, he was signally an innovator. Of absolute coinages his diction presents, perhaps, nothing; though I suspect it would cost a long search to find precedent for the substantive *dwindle:* and the same surmise may be entertained touching his use of *risible*, *prejudice*, *unexceptionably*, and *unideal*. As to his words, it is chiefly by his fondness for ponderous vocables of Latin derivation that he is distinguished from most of his educated contemporaries. His style has been well described in a passage which I take from a somewhat obscure source. "The writings of Addison and Dr. Johnson have often been compared. One of the chief points of contrast in their style lies, I apprehend, in the easy and natural recurrence, in the former, of the verb; and the artificial prepondérance given, in the latter, to the noun. Since Dr. Johnson's time, the substantive has been gaining ground; the infinitive mood, the gerund, and the compound participle have been, in the same proportion, suppressed, in many works of which the composition is highly elaborate. As far as unstudied writings can be expressed in set phrases, the usurpation has extended even to these." Anglicus, in *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register*, &c., Vol. 6 (1818), p. 459.

become obsolete," I have begun a chapter for which there are no distinctive contents available. As to

---

Author as Johnson was of a dictionary and of a grammar of our language, his views of grammatical propriety, as he practically exemplified them, were, on many points, unsettled, or worse. This, and much besides, will plainly enough be evidenced by the subjoined extracts.

"*Neither* search *nor* labour *are* necessary." *The Idler*, No. 44.

Thus he ordinarily constructs *neither* . . *nor*; but he also writes, more like a modern:

"I cannot forbear to mention, that *neither* reason *nor* revelation *denies* you to hope," &c. *Letter to Mr. James Elphinston*, Sept. 25, 1750.

"Ignorance *or* dulness *have*, indeed, no power of affording delight; but they never give disgust, except when they assume the dignity of knowledge, or ape the sprightliness of wit." *The Rambler*, No. 179. Also see *The Idler*, No. 87.

"*Each* of these histories *contain* facts," &c. Dedication to *The Evangelical History*, &c.

"I found some books on a shelf, among which *were a* volume or more of 'Prideaux's Connection'." *A Journey*, &c., Anoch.

"The *number* of printers *were* small." *An Essay on the Origin and Importance of Small Tracts and Fugitive Pieces.*

"The second person may tell the secret to the third, upon the same principle *as* he received it from the first." *The Rambler*, No. 13.

"Its memory is continued for the same reason *as* its vehemence was at first promoted." *Ibid.*, No. 40.

"If travellers were to describe the most laboured performances of art with the same coldness *as* they survey them, all expectations of happiness from change of place would cease." *The Idler*, No. 50.

"He mingled in cursory conversation with the same steadiness of attention *as* others apply to a lecture." *Life of Savage.*

"Other men receive dignity from dress; but my booby looks always more *meanly* for his finery." *The Idler*, No. 95.

"The beauty remarks how *frightfully* she looks." *The Rambler*, No. 193.

"The learned, the judicious, the pious Boerhaave relates, that he never saw a criminal dragged to execution, without asking himself, 'Who knows whether this man is not less culpable than *me*?'" *The Rambler*, No. 114.

"No man had ever more discernment than *him*, in finding out the ridiculous, nor a more ingenious manner of showing it to others." *A Dissertation on the Greek Comedy.*

such contents for it, however, I find myself embarrassed by superabundance of material, rather than

---

"Many of the blessings universally desired are very frequently wanted; because most men, when they should labour, content themselves *to complain*," &c. *The Rambler*, No. 178. Also see No. 5.

"Capable *to give* us shade." *Preface to Shakespeare.* "Persisting *to deny* the charge." *Life of Waller.*

"Being now received, as a wit, among the wits, he paid his contributions to literary undertakings, and assisted *both* the Tatler, Spectator, and Guardian." *Life of Hughes.*

One should not object to '*both* the Tatler, *and the* Spectator, *and the* Guardian'.

"The solace arising from this consideration seems, indeed, *the weakest of all others*, and is, perhaps, never properly applied, but in cases where there is no place for reflections of more speedy and pleasing efficacy." *The Rambler*, No. 52.

"I *intended to have written* about Raarsa." *Letter to Mrs. Thrale*, Sept. 14, 1773.

"There was once a design, hinted at by Oldisworth, *to have made* him useful." *Life of Edmund Smith.*

"*Every man* who valued himself upon the graces of his person, or the elegance of his address, *crowded about me;* and wit and splendour contended for my notice." *The Rambler*, No. 130.

"The comparison of *his* [Milton's] *numbers* with *those who* have cultivated the same manner of writing, will shew," &c. *Ibid.*, No. 90.

"Davenant was, perhaps, at this time, his favourite author, though 'Gondibert' *never appears* to have been popular." *Life of Dryden.*

"He that conveys knowledge by more pleasing ways may very properly be loved as a benefactor; and he that supplies life with innocent amusement *will be certainly caressed* as a pleasing companion." *The Idler*, No. 85.

"There is no tree *for either* shelter or timber." *A Journey*, &c., Aberbrothick.

"This fraud *could only be counteracted* by an edition equally cheap and more commodious." *Life of Pope.*

"But words *are only hard* to those who do not understand them," *The Idler*, No. 70.

Johnson has many sentences like the two last. In the next, "only by" is for 'by merely'.

"Cuddies are so abundant, at some times of the year, that they are caught like whitebait in the Thames, *only by* dipping a basket and drawing it back." *A Journey*, &c., Talisker in Sky.

"*However inferior* to the heroes who were born in better ages, he

by deficiency; and the reader will be enabled to judge, from the particulars about to be set forth,

---

might still be great among his contemporaries, with the hope of growing every day greater, in the *dwindle* of posterity." *Life of Milton.*

"I know that great regard will be had to your opinion of an edition of Shakespeare. I desire, therefore, to secure an honest *prejudice* in my favour, by securing your suffrage," &c. *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 183.

"The reciprocal civility of authors is one of the most *risible* scenes in the farce of life." *Life of Sir Thomas Browne.*

"A few wild blunders and *risible* absurdities . . . . may, for a time, furnish folly with laughter," &c. *Dictionary*, Preface.

"The serious and *risible* part" of a play. *Life of Dryden.*

Risible is thus used by Charles Macklin, *Love à la Mode*, Act 1, Scene 1.

"If he carries the scalping-knife and *tom-axe*, there are many true Britons that will never be persuaded to see him but through a grate." *The Idler*, No. 40.

"These observations are to be considered not as *unexceptionably* constant, but as containing general and predominant truth." *Preface to Shakespeare.*

The right word is *invariably*, or *absolutely*, or, to use a modernism, *unexceptionally*. However, in Dupré's *Lexicographia Neologica Gallica* (1801), "Ajouter un article *exceptionnel* à une loi" is rendered "To add an *exceptionable* article to a law." And Mr. Ruskin writes: "How few of us have any brains or souls worth speaking of, or fit to trust to; that being the, alas! almost *unexceptionable* lot of human creatures." *Fors Clavigera*, Letter 7, p. 9.

"We amuse ourselves with *unideal* sounds." *The Rambler*, No. 184.

"Weary of the drudgery of pronouncing *unideal* sounds." *Life of Milton.*

"He delighted to tread upon the brink of meaning, where light and darkness begin to mingle; to approach the precipice of absurdity, and hover over the abyss of *unideal* vacancy." *Life of Dryden.*

Since *ideal* does not mean 'containing ideas', *unideal* cannot mean 'void of ideas', 'idealess'.

"All foreigners remark, that the knowledge of the common people of England is greater than that of any other *vulgar*." *The Idler*, No. 7.

"Painting is so nearly allied to poetry, that *it cannot be wondered*, that those who have so much esteemed the one have paid an equal regard to the other." *An Account of the Harleian Library.*

whether there was not a close analogy, here and there, between the language of our grandparents[1] and

---

Here follow a Latinism, a Gallicism, and a Scotticism.

"Dryden had been *more* accustomed to hostilities *than that* such enemies *should break* his quiet." *Life of Prior.*

"What he had *of humorous* or passionate he seems to have had, not from nature, but from other poets." *Life of Dryden.*

"They who read his character will not much condemn Sacharissa, *that* she did not descend from her rank to his embraces," &c. *Life of Waller.*

"The difficulties through which this work has struggled into light, and the delays with which our hopes have been long mocked, naturally lead the mind to the consideration of the common fate of *posthumous compositions.*" *The Idler*, No. 64.

How can a *composition* date after its author's death?

"He *expired*, . . . having *enjoyed*, by the benefit of his regimen, a long and healthy life, and a gentle and easy *death.*" *Life of Morin.*

This extraordinary person not only enjoyed his death, but first died and then expired.

So Gibbon has: "Of the nineteen tyrants who started up under the reign of Gallienus, there was not one who *enjoyed* a life of peace, or a natural *death.*"

The expression '*enjoy* bad health' has often been ridiculed. But even the French, with all their much-vaunted logical instinct, sometimes commit analogous blunders. See *Le Redresseur* (1866), by M. P. G. de Dumast, p. 98. Exception is there taken to "Les commerçants chinois *jouissent* d'une assez *mauvaise réputation*," and to "Mon frère *jouit* d'une très-*mauvaise santé.*"

But Johnson by no means stands alone, among writers of fame, for perpetration of bulls.

"The poor man has been afflicted with the most lasting fit of the gout he ever underwent before." Shenstone, *Letters*, No. 88.

How can a fit of gout be its own antecedent?

"It was the most beautiful scene of animal enjoyment that I ever beheld, or ever shall behold." Southey, *Colloquies*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 146.

An experience referred to the future is here included among experiences declaredly past.

I return to Johnson presently, where I speak of archaisms.

[1] Of the books, &c., quoted in this chapter, there are very few, if any, which were not written, or revised, subsequently to 1760. This fact I state, lest my younger readers should misinterpret my title. My *own grandfathers* both died in 1809; and everything that is here

their full-bottomed caxons and ramellies, their ruffs and petenlairs, and their spinets and minuets.

Personal peculiarities of vocabulary, whether archaisms or coinages,[1] though their presence in the

adduced must have been familiar to them. They were not, to be sure, Englishmen by birth,—nor were their fathers before them, since the time of Elizabeth or James I.,—but, as Dr. Johnson phrases it, "New English". However, the great-grandfathers of my younger readers, and my own grandfathers, differed but little, as to literature and speech, from their fellow-subjects across the Ocean. No one who has explored their libraries has to be told, that, whether Puritans, Anabaptists, Quakers, or Churchmen, they used to get over the latest publications of the day, fresh and fresh, and devour them, just as their descendants have been doing ever since. That they understood them, and that, in their language, they kept up with the times, it would be needless to insist.

The quotations immediately to follow might easily be amplified tenfold; and I have forgone the accumulation of more, simply to keep down the size of the book. Some of the terms which they exemplify are quite obsolete everywhere; others have become localisms; and others, again, however widely current, have lost more or less of their former respectability. Not one of them, in short, at present holds the place which it held a hundred years ago. Several of them, though now unknown, I believe, except in England, are current there, among the vulgar, to a degree which would hardly be inferred from books. Such are *all as ever*, for 'in spite of all'; *as to-morrow*, for 'to-morrow'; *can't away with; because*, for 'in order that'; *each other time; get by*, for 'cheat'; *of its own head*, for 'spontaneously'; *i'n't*, for 'is not'; *lie*, for 'lodge'; *main*, for 'very'; *mort*, for 'large quantity'; *near*, for 'stingy'; *put upon*, for 'deceive'; *ungain*, for 'ungainly'; *that day was a month*, for 'that day month', or 'a month after that day'. As to *chamber*, *lief*, and a few other words, though Americans may be surprised to see them here, they have been introduced advisedly.

In the foot-notes, I have given, not unfrequently, references, and even supplementary extracts, in proof that the expressions exemplified in the body of the page do not belong exclusively to the latter half of the last century, but are of earlier origin, or have since then been used sporadically.

[1] As to archaisms, Dr. Johnson's are as instructive as those of any one else. I transcribe a few of them.

"By this *abruption* posterity lost more instruction than delight." *Life of Cowley.*

"The Sylphs and Gnomes *act*, at the toilet and the tea-table, what

phraseology of the days here contemplated demands recognition, are, as not being characteristic, only of

---

more terrific and more powerful phantoms perform on the stormy ocean, or the field of battle." *Life of Pope.*

"The person of Pope is well known not to have been formed *by* the nicest model." *Ibid.*

"The conclusion is too evidently modelled *by* that of Dryden." *Ibid.*

"It [peat] is like wood *charked* for the smith." *A Journey*, &c., Ostig in Sky.

"He *communicated* himself through a very wide extent of acquaintance." *Life of Garth.*

"We may reasonably conjecture, that . . . . their *composures* . . . . . were pastoral hymns," &c. *The Rambler*, No. 36.

Johnson, in his *Life of Milton*, uses *composure* for 'composing'.

"So certain is it, that *correction* is the touchstone of writing." *Dissertation on the Greek Comedy.*

"The church of Elgin . . . . was . . . suffered to *dilapidate*, by deliberate robbery and frigid indifference." *A Journey*, &c., Elgin. Also see the *Life of Dyer.*

"This Essay affords an *egregious* instance of the predominance of genius, the dazzling splendour of imagery, and the seductive powers of eloquence." *Life of Pope.*

"Far the greater part of human minds never *endeavour* their own improvement." *Letter to Mrs. Thrale*, Aug. 5, 1775. Also see the *Life of Waller.*

"I did not observe that the common greens were wanting, and suppose, that, by choosing an advantageous *exposition*, they can raise all the more hardy esculent plants." *A Journey*, &c., Ostig in Sky.

"This is one of the few books which selection of sentiment and elegance of diction have been able to preserve, though written upon a subject *flux* and transitory." *Life of Sprat.*

"A hundred *hen-eggs*, new-laid, were sold, in the islands, for a penny." *A Journey*, &c., Lochbuy.

"If proper colonels were once appointed, and the drums ordered to beat for female volunteers, our regiments would soon be filled, without the reproach or cruelty of an *impress*." *The Idler*, No. 5.

"On the sincerity and punctuality of this confession I am willing to depend for all the future regard of mankind, and cannot but indulge some hopes, that they whom my offence has alienated from me may, by this instance of *ingenuity* and repentance, be propitiated and reconciled." *A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Douglas.*

"*If all attempts to innovate* the constitutional or habitual character

subordinate importance, with reference to the subject under consideration.

---

have really proceeded from public spirit," &c. *The Rambler*, No. 179.

"At her leisure hours, she *looks* goose-eggs, airs the wool-room, and turns the cheese." *Ibid.*, No 138.

"Our guides told us, that the horses could not travel all day without rest or *meat*," &c. *A Journey*, &c., Anoch.

"They were made, at once, insupportably insolent, and might, perhaps, have became irresistibly powerful, had not their *mountainous treasures* been scattered in the air, with the ignorant profusion of unaccustomed opulence." *Thoughts on the Late Transactions*, &c.

"Mountainous treasures" is for 'treasures contained in mountains.'

"Some have . . . . . ventured to condemn mankind *of* universal ingratitude." *The Rambler*, No. 145.

"The chief desire of him that *comments an author* is to shew," &c. *Preface to Shakespeare.*

In modern English, *on* is required after the verb *comment*.

"That [barn] . . . was so contrived . . . . as, by perpetual *perflation*, to prevent the mow from heating." *A Journey*, &c., Ostig in Sky.

"For want of a *process* of events, neither knowledge nor elegance preserve the reader from weariness." *Life of West.*

"He studied *all morning*, then dined at a tavern, and went, afterwards, to Button's." *Life of Addison.*

Southey has a like old idiom: "*Whole Nature* is amazed," &c., *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, p. 455, foot-note. "*All dáies* of his life." Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame* (1592), p. 7 (ed. 1841).

"They who grow rich by administering physic are not to be numbered with *them* that get money by dispensing poison." *Thoughts on the Late Transactions*, &c.

"It is difficult even for imagination to place us in the state of *them* whose story is related," &c. *Life of Cowley.*

"Dr. Warburton had a name sufficient to confer celebrity *to* those who could exalt themselves into antagonists," &c. *Preface to Shakespeare.*

Add the obsolete, or else rare, *argumental*, *conglobate*, *extemporal*, *insusceptive*, *meteorous*, *musculous*, *obtund*, *oraculous*, *orbity*, *propension*, *sinistrous*, *volant*, &c. &c.

In Cowper's *Letters* are the following words, many of which are used playfully: the substantives *archdeaconism*, *beautification*, *commentatorship*, *frogship*, *hemicycle*, *joltation*, *midshipmanship*, *scurryfunging*, *seldomcy*, *subscalarian*, *translatorship*; the adjectives *authorly*, *deedy*, *epipoultrical*, *escritorial*, *exsputory*, *extraforaneous*, *homotonous*: and the verbs active *disperiwig*, *epistolize*, *pacify*, and *ramfeezle*.

Among preterites and participles, many which are now heard from none but the grossly ignorant, had, not very long ago, a reputation considerably fairer than indifferent. Examples are seen in *blowed*,[1] *catched*,[2]

Henry Brooke, in *The Fool of Quality*, has many strange terms. Among them are the substantives *bundlement*, *externity*, *internity*, *jumblement*, *reprobacy*, *whirrick*; the adjectives *admissive*, *compassive*, *inquisitory*, *mother-naked*, *reverable*, *yeanling*; the verbs active *disembrute*, *thieve*, *unprinciple*; the verbs neuter *anguish*, *domesticate*, *obtrude*; *caption* for 'arrest', *portage* for 'weight', *feasible* for 'probable', *defeat* for 'defeated', *overvalue* for 'exceed in value', *quarter* for 'explore'.

I certainly speak within bounds, in estimating at three thousand the expressions which I have collected, like those derived from Cowper and Brooke, ventured by writers belonging to the period of our language here in view, the period of the renascence which began during the last fifty years of the eighteenth century.

[1] Colman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, No. 56.

"They were puff'd up with a wind which *blowed* some good to mankind." Barrow, *Works* (ed. 1683—1692), Vol. 1, p. 207.

"At last he from the table rose;
He picked his teeth, and *blowed* his nose."
Sir John Vanbrugh, *Esop*, Act 2.

Also see *The Cruel Assault of Gods Fort* (1560?), in *Old Ballads*, &c. (1840), p. 31: Sir Thomas Urquhart, Translation of *Rabelais* (ed. 1694), Vol. 2, p. 129: De Foe, *Moll Flanders* (ed. 1840), p. 271; *The Political History of the Devil* (ed. 1840), p. 92.

[2] "The friar *catched* eagerly at her request of his advice," &c. Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Chapter 4. Also see *Historic Doubts*, &c., p. 100.

Hawkesworth, *The Adventurer*, Nos. 5, 8, 86, 94. Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c. (ed. 1810), p. 397: *The Deuce is in Him*, Act 2, Scene 1. Henry Brooke, *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act 1, Scene 4.

"*Tooke.* Do you tolerate *catched*?

"*Johnson.* Sir, I was *teached* better."
Landor, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 153.

In Johnson's *Grammar* we read, however:

"*Fight*, *teach*, *reach*, *seek*, *beseech*, *catch*, *buy*, *bring*, *think*, *work*, make *fought*, *taught*, *raught*, *sought*, *besought*, *caught*, *bought*, *brought*, *thought*, *wrought*.

"But a great many of these retain likewise the regular form; as *teached*, *reached*, *beseeched*, *catched*, *worked*."

Teached I do not think I have met with often. When about to

digged,[1] *shined*,[2] *slided*,[3] *throwed*,[4] and in *begun*,[5] *bespoke*,[6] *broke*,[7] *eat*,[8] *rid*,[9] *rode*,[10] *run*,[11] *spoke*,[12]

---

transcribe the following rude rimes, I noticed that Dr. Johnson had quoted part of the stanza:

"As huswives are *teached*, in stead of a clocke,
How winter night passeth, by crowing of cocke,
So, here, by the planets, as farre as I dare,
Some lessons I leave for the husbandmans share."

Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes of Good Husbandrie*, &c. (1573), Ch. 14, st. 1.

1 "Mr. Blackwell has neither *digged* in the ruins of any demolished city, nor," &c. Dr. Johnson, *Review of 'Memoirs of the Court of Augustus'*.

2 "Their learning, at best, was such as could only have *shined* in dark times." Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 166.

3 "The declivities grew more precipitous, and the sand *slided* from beneath my feet." Dr. Johnson, *The Vision of Theodore*.

Also see Godwin, *An Enquiry*, &c. (ed. 1793), p. 353.

"The metallic surfaces were *slided* back." Lord Lytton, *The Coming Race* (6th ed., 1872), p. 205.

4 "I had rather Major G. *throwed* away his money than somebody else." Gray, *Works* (ed. Mitford, 1858), Vol. 3, p. 282.

"The Pastorells *overthrowd* in France." Fuller, *The Historie of the Holy Warre* (ed. 1647), A Chronologicall Table, under A.D. 1250.

5 "I shall finish where you *begun*, with my apology." Gray, *The Correspondence of Gray and Mason* (ed. 1855), p. 355. Also see p. 455. See, further, Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, pp. 273, 317.

"On with your art! Proceed as you *begun*!
Why dwindle to a cruet from a tun?"

Colman, *Epistle to the Pisos*.

6 "He informed me that he had *bespoke* ordinary chairs for common use," &c. Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 200.

Also see Colman, Prologue to *The Capuchin*: Lord Camden (1774), in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 2.

7 Johnson, *The Rambler*, Nos. 1, 59, 119. Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 10. Cowper (1783), *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 133. Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., p. 201. Mrs. Inchbald, *The Child of Nature*, Act 1, Scene 1. "An *unbroke* horse." Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 4.

8 "Under this easy government, the first generations of men breathed the fragrance of perpetual spring, *eat* the fruits," &c. Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 33.

[9 10 11 12 Notes in the next page.]

writ,[1] *wrote*,[2] for *began, bespoken, broken, ate, rode, ridden, ran, spoken, wrote, written*.[3] And no less inelegant seems to us, in the present day, the mismarriage of numbers in *you was*, which once was

---

[9] "I *rid* my match in this very dress, yesterday." Charles Macklin, *Love à la Mode*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[10] "Having *rode*." Miss Burney, *Evelina* (ed. 1779), Vol. 2, Ch. 2: Southey, *Life of Wesley* (ed. 1864), Vol. 2, p. 20.

[11] Gray, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 1. Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 6. Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 6, Ch. 4. Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways Than One*, Act 4: *Who's the Dupe?*, Act 1, Scene 1. Mrs. Inchbald, *The Midnight Hour*, Act 3, Scene 1. Gibbon, *Miscellaneous Works* (ed. 1814), Vol. 5, p. 298.

[12] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 4, Ch. 2.

[1] "I *writ* in terms more pressing, but without effect." Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 171.

"He *writ*, and hunted, and despatched ambassadors," &c. *Id.* (1756), *An Introduction to the Political State of Great Britain.*

And so Arthur Murphy, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 519.

"He is a happy man who *writ* that letter." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 10.

Writ was used for *written*, also. "Is it you who have *writ* this?" Gen. Conway, *False Appearances*, Act 4. Also see Miss Carter (1789), *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 3, p. 314, and often.

[2] "They were *wrote* without communication." Dr. Johnson, Dedication to *The Evangelical History*, &c.

"I hope you have *wrote* to him the state of your mind." Edmund Burke (1797), *The Epistolary Correspondence of Burke and Dr. French Laurence*, p. 128. Also see *Correspondence*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 150.

Sterne, *Works* (ed. 1819), Vol. 4, p. 367. Gray, *The Correspondence of Gray and Mason* (ed. 1855), pp. 331, 397, 430, &c. George Colman, *Terræ Filius*, No. 3: Prologue to *The Chapter of Accidents*. William Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 38; Vol. 15, p. 26. Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 1. Miss Hannah More, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 228.

[3] I stop, only because it seems needless to go on. Gray has *chose*, for *chosen*; Miss Carter, *drove*, for *driven*; Mrs. Inchbald, *forsook*, for *forsaken*; Miss Carter, *shook*, for *shaken*; William Cowper, "I had *sprang*"; Mrs. Inchbald, *stole*, for *stolen*; &c. &c. &c.

widely sanctioned by persons of the highest education.[1]

In the passages which I shall now quote, uses of prepositions and conjunctions, obsolete in our time, will be conspicuously observable. A much larger exhibition than will be found of worn-out substantives, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs, would easily be feasible, and has purposely been forgone; words belonging to these parts of speech being, in all ages, laid aside, as they are devised, with a readiness which cannot be predicated of employments of particles. It remains to be added, concerning those exemplifications of disused idioms which are adduced, that there is scarcely one of them but was chosen from at least a dozen, extracted from the writings of as many different authors.

"I must tell you, sir, that I believe you 'll not make a better husband than *a* friend."[2]

"Oh for *a* shame! Would you throw that away upon a brute, which is due to your fellow-creatures?"[3]

"A draft upon my neighbour was to me the same as

---

[1] "As I told you, when *you was* here," &c. Cowper (1780), *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 16. Also see Vol. 15, pp. 33, 34, 45, 68.

"You *was* prevented by," &c. Bishop Shipley (1780), in *Memoirs . . . . of Sir William Jones*, p. 194.

"I am sorry *you was* disappointed of going to Vallombrosa." Horace Walpole (1791), in *Journals and Correspondence of Miss Berry*, Vol. 1, p. 367.

Also see Dr. Hawkesworth, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 536: Miss Carter (1785), *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 3, p. 258, and often: Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, *passim*.

[2] Gen. Conway, *False Appearances*, Act 5, Scene 2.

[3] Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 1.

money; for I was sufficiently convinced of his *ability*."[1]

"I have seen a huge oath quivering on the pale lip of a reigning toast for half an hour together, and an uplifted eye *accusing* the gods for the loss of an odd trick."[2]

"The first public-house, ... having been a well-*accustomed* inn," &c.[3]

"I *admire* where a fellow of his low rank should acquire such a nobleness and dignity of sentiment."[4]

"All these qualities *agree* just as well *to* the oak, against which he contends; and he actually attributes them to the very oak, in the next section."[5]

"I do believe the two Pretenders had, privately, *agreed* the matter beforehand."[6]

"I dare say you . . . had your boots stuffed with *all and all* manner of unlawful wares and merchandises."[7]

"He would not stay with me, *all as ever* I could say."[8]

"That will make no great difference; for I shall be able to prove my right to it, *all one*."[9]

---

[1] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 14.

[2] Murphy, *The Way to Keep Him*, Act 3. And so Southey. "The Romanists *accuse* the Protestants for their indifference." *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 1 (1809), p. 193.

[3] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote* (ed. 1820), Vol. 2, p. 51.

[4] Henry Brooke, *The Female Officer*, Act 1, Scene 13.

Admire, neuter and active, has been used, in the sense it here bears, even in our century.

"Nor is it to be *admired*, that some of the priests themselves were among the most zealous of the converts." Southey, *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 43 (1830), p. 13.

"M. Alphonse de Beauchamp makes the wall ten feet, without appearing to *admire* the leap." *Id., ibid.*, Vol. 15 (1816), p. 46.

[5] Bp. Lowth, *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Notes, p. 16. 'Fit' is intended.

[6] Gray, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 48. A little before Gray, Gay wrote: "I have affairs with my brother below; so *agree* the matter between yourselves." *The Distressed Wife*, Act 2, Scene 7.

[7] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 4.

[8] Miss Burney, *Evelina* (ed. 1779), Vol. 2, Letter 15. "*All that ever* I could say" occurs in Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 1, p. 265; Vol. 2, p. 123.

[9] Miss Burney, *Evelina*, Vol. 2, Letter 13.

"'T is *all along of* you that I am thus haunted." [1]

"I 'm, in talk, a pedant musical;
In fine terms I lug intrusical;
Slap bravuras, *alt*, the rage about,
Haydn, Mara, opera, stage about." [2]

"I have certainly knocked up my little roan gelding, in this damned wild-goose chace of three score miles *an end*." [3]

"A child naturally goes on all four;[4] and we know how difficult a matter it is to set him *an end*, or to keep him so." [5]

---

[1] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 2, p. 88. Sometimes, *all along with* was used, formerly. Foote, *The Devil upon Two Sticks*, Act 2; *The Maid of Bath*, Act 1.

For *long of*, in the same sense, see Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), p. 105.

[2] John O'Keeffe, *The Highland Reel*, Act 2, Scene 2. *Alt* is used for 'altitudes', that is to say, 'heroics', or the like, by Richardson, in *Clarissa Harlowe* (ed. 1811), Vol. 3, p. 55, and Vol. 5, p. 145. In the same work, Vol. 5, p. 232, we read: "From the nature of their conversation, there was no room for *altitudes*."

[3] Colman, *The Jealous Wife*, Act 2, Scene 1. "Five and twenty miles *an end*." Colman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, No. 105. Also see Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 7. p. 220.

"Wash sheepe for the better, where water doth runne;
And let him goe clenely, and drie in the sunne:
Then share him, and spare not, at two daies *an end*;
The sooner, the better his corps will amend."

Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes*, &c., Ch. 42, st. 1.

[4] For "upon all *four*", see the Bishop of Kilmore, in *Abel Redevivus*, p. 74: Jeremy Collier, *The Emperor Marcus Antoninus his Conversation*, &c., p. 257.

[5] Bp. Horne, *Olla Podrida*, No. 23. "My novice shall start, ho, and his haire stand *an end*." "With her haire *an end*." Dekker, *Satiro-mastix* (1602), sig. E 3 r and G 3 r. "Your hair stands up *an end*." Lodowick Carlell, *The Deserving Favorite* (1629), Act 2. "Standing *an end*." Bickerstaffe, *Love in a Village*, Act 2, Scene 3.

Robert Baker, in his *Remarks on the English Language*, &c. (ed. 1779), p. 114, says, of "stand *an* end": "Thus people pronounce and, most commonly, write."

At p. 83, Baker condemns *most an end*, meaning 'for the most part', used by Warburton. This expression I find in Bp. Sanderson,

"My lady Isabella is of *anotherguess* mould than you take her for." [1]

"The rewards, also, are, at public schools, as well chosen, and as *appropriated*, as the punishments." [2]

"Your lordship is so condescending to offer to enter it along with me." [3]

"*As* bad as your verses were, they are yours." [4]

"But, before punishment, he was to be heard *as* to-morrow." [5]

—*Sermons* (ed. 1681), Vol. 1, p. 69, and Vol. 2, p. 118,—and twice in *The Reason of Church Government*, &c., by Milton. And see the Dictionaries.

[1] Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Chapter 2. Also see Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 19.

[2] Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 233.

[3] Burke, *Correspondence*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 313.

Here we miss an *as*. In the two next extracts, there is an *as* now superfluous.

In the Elizabethan era, the second *as* of *as soon as* was sometimes omitted. "Let that burne first; and, *as soon* I see that on fire, I will walke towards my freends." *Tarlton's Jests*, &c. (ed. Mr. J. O. Halliwell), p. 103.

[4] Mason, *Correspondence of Gray and Mason*, p. 341. Also see Sheridan, *St. Patrick's Day*, Act 2, Scene 4.

[5] Bp. Warburton (1763), *A Selection from Unpublished Papers*, &c., p. 225.

"*As* to-morrow" means 'on the morrow' or 'to-morrow'. Priestley, writing in 1761, instances: "The books were to have been sold *as* this day." *The Rudiments of English Grammar*, &c. (ed. 1826), p. 86.

In books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, '*as* then' occurs, not unfrequently, for 'then'.

"This Brasilian king, being arrived, was brought up to London, and presented to King Henry 8, lying *as* then at Whitehall." Hakluyt, Vol. 1 (1589), p. 520.

"Because, quoth he, I saw them *as* then to endure both paines and perils willingly; but now I perceive they can beare prosperity wisely and with moderation." Philemon Holland, *Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 196.

"My greatest pastime *as* then was to read the feats of chivaldry." "I *as* then was very slender." *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 3, pp. 73, 74.

"It is a rule with me to receive every offer with the same civility *as* it is made." [1]

"Few minds are so base *as that* perseverance cannot amend." [2]

"I must tell you, my Harry, said he, *as how* you are a mighty good boy." [3]

"The two first lines of the following book seem to *ascertain* the true meaning of the conclusion of this." [4]

"A number of external successes, also, assisted to per-

Compare our '*as* yet': 'nobody has come *as* yet'. The old 'when *as*', often written as one word, is known to every one.

"I have been shipwrecked three times; and once, *as* now, I was the only man who escaped." Rev. Charles Kingsley, *Two Years Ago* (ed. 1857), Vol. 1, p. 113.

The context shows that "*as* now" here means 'on the present occasion'.

In other constructions, too, *as* was once used where we use it no longer. "Irenæus, the Apostle's scholer but once removed,—*as* who was scholer to Polycarpus, the scholer of St. John,—makes mention of the Apostles' Creed", &c. Ashwell, *Fides Apostolica* (1653), p. 76.

[1] Miss Mulso, *The Rambler*, No. 10. Also see Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 4, Ch. 19.

"It will be read with as much pleasure *as* it was represented." Bp. Warburton (1762), in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 141.

And somewhat similarly writes Coleridge, who often is very careless.

"It is asked in what sense I use these words. I answer: in the same sense *as* the terms are employed, when we refer to Euclid for the elements of the science of geometry," &c. *Church and State*, &c. (ed. 1839), p. 251.

Still more reprehensibly, Lord Macaulay, on one occasion, makes *as* stand for 'as that with which'.

"The king took the money of France, to assist him in the enterprise which he meditated against the liberty of his subjects, with as little scruple *as* Frederic of Prussia, or Alexander of Russia, accepted our subsidies in time of war." *Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History.*

[2] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 27.

[3] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 95.

[4] Cowper, *Odyssey*, note on the last line of Book 11. Also see Bp. Lowth, *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Notes, p. 5.

suade us, in those days, that felicity was to be attained and *ascertained* upon earth." [1]

"Like Parmegiano, he endeavours *at* grace and grandeur of manner," &c.[2]

"You shall have them *at* full. I have committed them to paper, for the instruction of future ages." [3]

"I . . . live in constant expectation of hearing something worse, and, *at* the long run, am seldom disappointed." [4]

"Whatever attention and volition are then imposed upon us, as it were *at* unawares, are but faint resemblances of our operations in the same kind, when awake." [5]

"Does not the substitution of one manufacture or industry for another require time? Does it not require time for an individual, thrust out of one *avocation*, to gain admittance to another?" [6]

---

[1] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 5.

In these two passages, the senses of *ascertain* are, respectively, 'determine' and 'make certain of', as contrasted with the present sense of the word, 'find out as determined or certain.'

[2] Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works* (ed. 1819), Vol. 2, p. 194.

[3] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 24. "They shifted full upon their shields, and stood so as they might behold the wall *at* full." Philemon Holland, *Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 166.

[4] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 289.

[5] Godwin, *An Enquiry*, &c. (ed. 1793), p. 868.

[6] *Id.*, *The Enquirer*, p. 196. Also see pp. 165, 188, 239. This use of *avocation*, for 'vocation', however common, has seldom had the sanction of good writers. Yet others than Godwin have trespassed into it.

"I did not think that any *avocation* or employment, however important, could have so much engrossed me." Richardson, *Correspondence*, Vol. 5, p. 64.

"Oh! people of our *avocation* differ in respect to conscience." Mrs. Inchbald, *Next-door Neighbours*, Act 2, Scene 1.

Sydney Smith writes of "the ancient *avocation* of picking pockets." *Works* (1-vol. ed.), p. 27.

Lord Lytton, in using it, stands pretty nearly alone, I suspect, among very recent writers of any celebrity. See *The Coming Race* (6th ed.,

"I cannot wonder that my wife
Took this so ill. Women are passionate,

1872), p. 195. It is no more good English than his "*commenced* to exist," at p. 139 of the same work.

Mr. Boucher denies that this substantive is used in the singular number; and Archdeacon Todd produces no instance of such a use. It is employed in the singular, in its proper sense, by Heylin.

"It seems, then, only as an *avocation*, as they diverted bishops and the rest in orders from doing the work of their vocation." *The History of Episcopacy* (1657), Part 2, p. 21.

For like instances, see Dr. William Twisse (1636), in Mede's *Works* (ed. 1664), p. 1037: Steele, *The Guardian*, No. 51: Aaron Hill, *Works* (ed. 1753), Vol. 2, p. 228: Johnson, *The Rambler*, Nos. 8, 27; *The Idler*, No. 3.

The plural, *avocations*, very anomalously, inverts, in most cases, the accepted signification of the singular.

On the one hand, for example, Colman and Thornton, in *The Connoisseur*, No. 70, use it for 'impediments'. And so does the learned Miss Carter.

"My answer to your letter is sufficiently expeditious, but would have been still more so, if I had not been interrupted by the headache and many other unpleasant *avocations*." *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 4, p. 117. Also see Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 26, 195; Vol. 6, p. 83.

On the other hand, it was long ago used, sometimes, to denote 'pursuits', 'duties'; and such is, I think, almost exclusively, its modern import.

"Making abatement for his military *avocations*, and late applying himself to study, scarce any one is to be preferred before him for generality of human learning." Fuller, *The Holy State*, &c., p. 72.

J. C. Scaliger is here spoken of; and the duties of a soldier constituted his calling, till he gave them up for literature.

"The youth must have more violent pleasures to employ his time; the man loves the hurry of an active life, devoted to the pursuits of wealth or ambition; and, lastly, old age, having lost its capacity for these *avocations*, becomes its own insupportable burthen." Grove, *The Spectator*, No. 626.

"I am now grown old in the *avocations* of the gown." Bishop Warburton (1724), *Tracts by Warburton*, &c., p. 15.

"When his other more momentous *avocations* of pedantry and pedagogueism will give him an interval from his wrath and contention," &c. De Foe, *The Political History of the Devil* (ed. 1840), p. 223.

"There are professions, among the men, no more favourable to these studies than the common *avocations* of women." Richardson, *Sir*

And can't *away with* such affronts as these." [1]

Charles Grandison, Vol. 6, pp. 393, 394. Also see *Correspondence*, Vol. 5, p. 127.

"It seems determined, by the general suffrage of mankind, that sorrow is, to a certain point, laudable, as the offspring of love, or, at least, pardonable, as the effect of weakness; but that it ought not to be suffered to increase by indulgence, but must give way, after a stated time, to social duties and the common *avocations* of life." Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 47.

"Mr. Briggs, however, has the entire management of your fortune; my many *avocations* obliging me to decline so laborious a trust." Miss Burney, *Cecilia* (1782), Book 2, Ch. 10.

"And a schoolboy is, perhaps, more qualified even for such an apprenticeship, as well as for the more honourable and hazardous *avocations* of the army or navy, than a young gentleman bred in a private family." Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 252.

"Or, if you are not averse to the task, and your *avocations* will allow you to undertake it," &c. Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 79. And see his Preface to the *Iliad*.

"The largest portion of each year was devoted to his professional duties and studies; and all the time that could be saved from these important *avocations* was dedicated to the cultivation of science and literature." Lord Teignmouth, *Memoirs . . . . of Sir William Jones* (ed. 1806), pp. 287, 288.

Also see Thomas Taylor, *The Commentaries of Proclus* (1792), Vol. 1, p. xxxiii. I omit references to Edward Moore, Paley, Godwin, Wordsworth, &c. &c.

Such is Southey's use of the word, and again and again, as in *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 2 (1809), p. 88; Vol. 34 (1826), p. 307; Vol. 37 (1828), p. 35: *Cowper's Works*, Vol. 2, p. 12.

"In a few hours, above thirty thousand men left his standard, and returned to their ordinary *avocations*." Lord Macaulay, *Essay on Warren Hastings*.

Also see Mr. Ruskin, *Lectures on Architecture and Painting*, p. 110; *Aratra Pentelici* (ed. 1872), p. 1.

Dr. Worcester, though he says that *avocation* "is sometimes improperly used in the sense of 'vocation', a profession, or regular pursuit," defines by it *employment* and *engagement*. Dr. Webster's Editors lay down that *avocation*, for 'vocation', "is very improper"; and yet they give, as synonyms of *engagement*, "avocation, business, employment, occupation." On the sense of *avocations*, above treated of, they are silent.

[1] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 326.

"I have been, three days ago, *bad* again with a spitting of blood."[1]

"This is some conspiracy, I suppose, to *bam*, to chouse me out of my money."[2]

"It was all a *bam*, madam, a scene we thought proper to act."[3]

"And I promise you she shan't *be to seek* for the means."[4]

"Her mother chose that name for her, said he, *because* she should not be called by her own."[5]

"I am, at least, very unwilling to esteem 'John Gilpin' as *better worth* than all the rest that I have written."[6]

"I was *blooded*, indeed, but to no purpose."[7]

"Mr. Sterling will never get rid of Blackfriars, always taste of the *borachio*," &c.[8]

"Give me leave to wind up the *bottom* of my loose thoughts on conversation," &c.[9]

---

[1] Sterne, *Letters*, No. 106. Also see Miss Carter, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 1, p. 209.

[2] Foote, *The Cozeners*, Act 3, Scene 1.

[3] Murphy, *The Way to Keep Him*, Act 4.

[4] *Foote, The Maid of Bath*, Act 3. Also see Richardson, *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 1, p. 257: Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 3.

[5] Richardson, *Pamela* (ed. 1811), Vol. 2, p. 361. *Because* here means 'in order that'. Also see Colman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, No. 97: Mrs. Inchbald, *Next-door Neighbours*, Act 2, Scene 1. For a modern instance, see Mr. Charles Reade, *Put Yourself in His Place* (ed. 1870), Vol. 1, p. 49. For an old one, see Dekker, *The Dead Tearme* (1608), fol. 4 v.

[6] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 182. Compare the old "*better* cheap." In Vol. 15, p. 16, Cowper has "little worth", for 'worth little'.

[7] *Id., ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 60. Also see Johnson, *Life of Dryden*: Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 5: Sydney Smith, *Works* (1-vol. ed.), p. 523.

[8] Colman and Garrick, *The Clandestine Marriage*, Act 2, Scene 1. "Must such *borrachos* as you take upon you to vilify a man of science?" Dryden, *An Evening's Love*, Act 3.

[9] Colman, *The Gentleman*, No. 5. See Bentley, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 537: Charles Dibdin, *The Deserter*, Act 1, Scene 1.

"If it had come to an oath, I don't think he would have *bounced*, neither; but, in common occurrences, there is no repeating after him." [1]

"I'll be her *bridemaid*, and, before she has been your wife six hours, give her more longings for laces, diamonds, feathers, and fops, than can be gratified in six years." [2]

"I now know the town too well to be ever its *bubble*." [3]

"And so here I am *bubbled* and choused out of my money." [4]

"I'll write to my Lady Conquest, to know the truth about that girl that was here *but* now." [5]

"*Buxom*, which means only 'obedient', is now made, in familiar phrases, to stand for 'wanton'." [6]

---

[1] Foote, *The Liar*, Act 2, Scene 1. Also see Colman, Epilogue to *A Friend in Need is a Friend Indeed:* John O'Keeffe, *The Farmer*, Act 1, Scene 2. In the silence of the Dictionaries, I had better add, that *bounce* here signifies 'lie'.

[2] Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways than One*, Act 1. Also see Foote, *The Commissary*, Act 3: Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 4, Ch. 7. Now we say *bridesmaid*. Contrariwise, instead of our *poor-box*, the old expression was *poor's box*. See Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 4.

[3] Foote, *The Minor*, Act 3, Scene 2.

[4] Murphy, *The Citizen*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[5] *Id.*, *All in the Wrong*, Act 1, Scene 1. Also see Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 265. This use is old. See Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 248: Milton, *Prose Works* (Bohn's ed.), Vol. 1, p. 412.

"He who *but* now was little less than an angel of light shall be painted in the blackest colours, for a slip of the tongue," &c. Hazlitt, *Characteristics* (ed. 1837), p. 25.

[6] Johnson, *The Plan of an English Dictionary*. *Buxom* had long had 'wanton' for one of its meanings.

"Make much of every *buxome* girl,
Which needs but little courting;
Her value is above the pearl,
That takes delight in sporting."
Sir George Etherege, *The Comical Revenge*, Act 2, Scene 3.

"When they came still nearer, the *canking* of some Spanish geese, the gobbling of turkeys," &c.[1]

"It does not institute a magnificent auction of finance, where *captivated* provinces come to general ransom, by bidding against each other," &c.[2]

"I . . . can think of nothing, and wish for nothing, but laugh, gig, humour, fun, pun, conundrum, *carriwitchet*, and Catherine Clive."[3]

"Adjoining to your *chamber* . . . . is a very decent room, in which your own maid might repose herself to her wish."[4]

"At last, a *chapman* approached, and, after he had a good while examined the horse round," &c.[5]

"We find ourselves almost inextricably involved in a bloody and *chargeable* civil war."[6]

"Your faithful lover is, probably, *cheapening* a hunter."[7]

"Matter? Why, I am invited to dinner on barbecue, and the villains have forgot my bottle of *chian*."[8]

"Here the company stared; as it was well known that he never had but one brother, who died of the *chin-cough*."[9]

---

[1] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 158. Also see Shenstone, *Letters*, No. 15.

[2] Burke, *Speech on Conciliation with America*.

[3] Garrick, *Private Correspondence*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 296. Also see Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 115.

This term, for 'absurd question', is still heard now and then.

[4] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 278. Also see Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 19.

[5] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 14.

[6] Burke, *Correspondence*, Vol. 2, p. 122. Also see Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 2, Ch. 1.

[7] Colman, *The Jealous Wife*, Act 2, Scene 3. Also see Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 4.

[8] Foote, *The Patron*, Act 1. "'T is *Chian* pepper, indeed. A little will go a great way." Garrick, *A Peep behind the Curtain*, Act 1, Scene 2. Also see Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 219. Were the words *Chian* and *Cayenne* confounded? Colman, in his Prologue to *The East-Indian*, has "his temper hot as *Kayan*."

[9] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 36. See Bishop

"Here my lord and lady took such a *chink* of laughing, that it was some time before they could recover." [1]

"The landlady now returned, to know if we did not *choose* a more genteel apartment." [2]

"Now, by this good day, master Pamphilus
Has got a *chopping* boy." [3]

"Your hot cakes and your eggs are good; and that that 's good is the delight of a *churchman*." [4]

"As it [Ireland] escaped the dominion of the Romans, so was it likewise deprived of the benefits which their government generally introduced,—order, laws, *civility*, cultivation." [5]

"If you could write directly, it would be *clever*." [6]

"We could not have been in so *clever* a place as this is, circumstanced as we are, this summer." [7]

Lavington, *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared*, p. 285.

[1] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 95.

[2] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 21. "Would you *choose* any refreshment?" Foote, *The Knights*, Act 2. Also see Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, pp. 45, 249: Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 4, Ch. 10.

The following is from a book written only the other day. "'Du I *chuse* any more?' I ses, 'why, I *want* some more'." *Giles's Trip to London*, p. 32.

"*Choose*, to, is used by low-bred people, with the peculiar meaning of to choose not to take what is offered. A dish offered at table is declined with the words 'I don't *choose* any'." Professor M. Schele de Vere, *Americanisms*, p. 453.

This use of *choose* is no Americanism. In defining it, Professor De Vere, as is not unfrequently the case with him, says something very different from what he intends.

[3] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 38.

[4] John O'Keeffe, *The Prisoner at Large*, Act 2, Scene 3.

[5] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 166. In the next page, the Bishop has *civilization*. This was in 1773.

[6] Gray, *Correspondence of Gray and Mason*, p. 88.

[7] Miss Talbot, *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 191. "*These clever* apartments." Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 290.

"My adversaries, on all sides, are such *cocks of the game*, that," &c.[1]

"We 'll go, brother Toby, said my father, whilst dinner is *coddling*." [2]

"When he perceived, in the midst of the *combustion* he had raised, that Lady Margaret was incensed," &c.[3]

"A pretty lodging we have hit upon; the mistress a *commode*, and the master a —." [4]

"Dear sister, the bearer of this letter is a lady . . . whose case is truly *compassionate*, and whom I most earnestly recommend to your protection," &c.[5]

Clever, as here used by Gray and the rest, is for 'convenient', 'commodious'.

[1] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 113. *Cock of the game* was long used where we use *game-cock*.

[2] Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 7, Chapter 27.

[3] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 2.

[4] Foote, *The Englishman in Paris*, Act 1. *Commode* here means 'bawd'.

"That 's the old phrase for one of those *commode* ladies who lend out beauty, for hire, to young gentlemen that have pressing occasions." Steele, *The Conscious Lovers*, Act 5.

[5] Colman, *The Deuce is in Him*, Act 1, Scene 1.

"Your case is truly a *compassionate* one." *Id.*, *The English Merchant*, Act 5, Scene 1.

"I am afraid neither of us can represent it as a very *compassionate* case." Miss Talbot, *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 33.

Also see Lord Chesterfield, *The World*, No. 29.

Besides its ordinary signification, *compassionate*—like the Italian *compassionevole*,—was thus used to mean 'of a nature to move pity'. As this meaning, which it bore for a long period, is rather slighted by our lexicographers, and is wholly overpassed by Dr. Webster and his editors, a few old testimonies will not be out of place.

"*Compassionate* cruelty." John Taylor, *Works* (ed. 1630), Vol. 2, p. 160.

"For, certainly, it were a very *compassionate* spectacle, to see," &c. Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), p. 32.

"The cryes of the people for the innumerable extortions and oppres-

"He ought to be fearful of putting into the hands of youth writers indulgent to the peculiarities of their own *complexion*, lest they should teach the humours of the professor, rather than the principles of the science."[1]

"No conversation of any kind passed between the two persons supposed to be mentioned, except *complimental* expressions," &c.[2]

"The melancholy office of *condoling* a loss," &c.[3]

"Mr. Horne, it seems, is unable to comprehend how an extreme want of *conduct* and discretion can consist with the abilities I have allowed him."[4]

"They *congratulate* our return, as if we had been with Phipps or Banks."[5]

"I am afraid it will not be easy to check the general passion for distinctness and *conspicuity*."[6]

"It contributed a good deal to confirm me in the *contemptible* idea I always entertained of Cellarius."[7]

---

sions that were committed upon them, and the tears and *compassionate* groans that were heard for the expulsion of justice and equity, were enough to have melted and wrought pity in the very marble it self." Translation of *Il Cardinalismo di Santa Chiesa* (1670), p. 21.

Compassionate, a substantive, for 'one who compassionates', is used by William Watson, *A Decacordon*, &c. (1602), pp. 190, 268.

[1] Burke, *Letter to a Member of the National Assembly*. For *complexional* and *complexionally*, employed correspondingly, see Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, and *Letter to a Member*, &c.

[2] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 19. Also see Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 186.

[3] Miss Carter, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 3, p. 247.

[4] *Letters of Junius*, No. 54.

[5] Johnson, *Letter to Mrs. Thrale*, Nov. 12, 1773. "*Congratulating* her arrival." *Id.*, *Life of Waller*. Also see Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works*, Vol. 1, p. 29.

[6] Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., p. 138. Also see William Taylor, *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 6 (1798), p. 553; *The Annual Review*, Vol. 2 (1804), p. 253.

[7] Gibbon, *Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 5, p. 286. Also see his *History of the Decline and Fall*, &c., Chapter 61: Gay, *Achilles*, Act 1; *The Distressed Wife*, Act 4, Scene 3. References to Sir Roger

"It goes into the world with a prancing list de toute la noblesse, which will bring me in three hundred pounds, exclusive of the sale of the *copy*."[1]

"You are born a manorial serf, or a *crèolian* negro," &c.[2]

"I am sure you did not in the least comprehend what

L'Estrange, Jeremy Collier, Warburton, Richardson, Sterne, Mrs. Pilkington, Colman, Wilkes, Graves, &c. &c., might be added.

Old instances of the misuse of *contemptible* and *contemptibly* are very common. "Those boxes . . . . . are *contemptibly* thrust into the rear." Dekker, *The Gulls Hornbook* (1609), p. 135 (ed. 1812).

See, further, the foot of p. 168, *supra*.

This misuse is very old, even older than Shakespeare, who might be quoted for it. "The same easie and *contemptible* opinion he held of all creatures; the like also he did of God himselfe." *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings*, &c. (1594), fol. 23 r.

Instances of *contemptuous*, for 'contemptible', are not unknown.

"And, to declare a *contemptuouse* chaunge from religion to superstition againe, the prestes had sodainly set up all the aulters and ymages in the cathedrall churche." Bishop Bale, *The Vocacyon*, &c. (1553), in *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park, 1810), Vol. 6, p. 454. Also see p. 451. For a still earlier instance (1544) in Bale, see his *Select Works* (1849), p. 57.

"Those abject and *contemptuous* wickednesses, thus demonstrated unto me, fashioned such a forme of obedience and feare to beware, in me, that," &c. *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings*, &c., fol. 18 v. Also see fol. 3 v.

[1] Sterne, *Letters*, No. 55. And so, for 'copy-right,' *copy* is used in the *Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 5, p. 3; by an anonymous writer in *Abel Redevivus* (1651), p. 48; and by Johnson, Foote, Cowper, and Miss Carter. This sense of the word is not in the Dictionaries. Nor is that of 'size of a manuscript'.

"The *copy* is but small, sir. 'T will make but a shilling thing." *The Humours of Whist* (1743), Epilogue.

Copy has, further, been used for 'edition'. James, *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture*, &c. (1612), Part 4, p. 76.

Also, for the 'original' of a translation. William Webbe (1586), in *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, pp. 46, 48, 50.

[2] Godwin, *An Enquiry*, &c., p. 472. And so Wilkes, Colman, R. O. Cambridge, &c. &c. For *creolian*, as a substantive, see Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 20: R. O. Cambridge, *The World*, No. 123.

I meant, by your giving me answers so very *cross* to the purpose."[1]

"The *cuckoldly* husband might put his horns quietly in his pocket, if he was not industriously pointed out for a monster."[2]

"Had I not thought him what I 've spoken of him,
I would not, for his daughter's sake, have drawn
So many troubles on our family,
Whom this old *cuff* now treats so scandalously."[3]

"Between ourselves, Mr. Lieutenant, the man did not speak much beside the *cushion* of common sense."[4]

"Even before it is clearly known whether the innovation be *damageable*, or not, the judge is competent to issue a prohibition to innovate, until the point can be determined."[5]

"In full day-light, the sun, as it were, *decompounds* what had been so happily mixed together, and separates a striking whole into detached unimpressive parts."[6]

"Had a potent enemy invaded Sodom, and a courageous army been required to give a brave repulse, nothing could have inspired the *defendants* with truer courage, than virtue and the fear of God."[7]

"The old gentleman . . . most respectfully *demanded*

---

[1] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 414.

[2] Colman, *The Genius*, No. 14. And see Vanbrugh, *The Provoked Wife*, Act 4, Scene 3; Act 5, Scene 2.

[3] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 363.

[4] Henry Brooke, *The Female Officer*, Act 1, Scene 13. See Richard Bernard, *Terence in English* (1588), pp. 70, 230 (ed. 1607): Hamon L'Estrange, *The Observator Observed* (1656), p. 36.

"Philelphus, in diverse places, had missed the *cushen*, whiche places Raphael doeth restore and correcte, and yet somewhere stumbleth hymselfe." Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), The Preface of Erasmus, sig. * 8 r. Also see fol. 313 r.

[5] Burke, *Letters on a Regicide Peace*.

[6] Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., pp. 125, 126.

[7] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 289.

if I was any way related to the great Primrose, that courageous monogamist," &c.[1]

"You may *deny* me to accompany you, but cannot hinder me from following."[2]

"The Portuguese, sure, will never *deny* to fulfil the rest of the article."[3]

"You, my Lord, are not reduced to so deplorable a state of *dereliction*."[4]

"They are entirely at our *devotion*, and may be turned backward and forward, as we please."[5]

"She herself was so conscious of it, that, while I *discoursed* her," &c.[6]

"England is *disfurnished* of its forces."[7]

"We were roused from a peaceful *dish* of tea, by a loud hubbub in the street," &c.[8]

"Our author would have looked upon it as an instance of great *disingenuity* in some zealot of the Church, had he found," &c.[9]

"So *disnatured* are they, that they neglect their own flesh and blood, to listen to accounts of your wit and spirit."[10]

---

[1] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 14. Also see Ch. 9, 10, 18. In Ch. 25 and 31, occurs the substantive *demand*, for 'question'.

[2] Johnson, *Rasselas*, Ch. 14. Also see Richardson, *Pamela* (ed. 1811), Vol. 1, p. 147.

[3] Sheridan, *The Duenna*, Act 3, Scene 1.

[4] *Letters of Junius*, No. 66.

[5] Godwin, *The Enquirer*, p. 363. And so Goldsmith, *Letters of Junius*, Horace Walpole, Miss Burney, Sir William Jones, Burke, &c. &c.

[6] Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Chapter 2.

[7] Burke, *Correspondence*, Vol. 2, p. 47.

[8] Beckford (1787), *Italy*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 70. Also see Colman, Prologue to *The East-Indian*.

[9] Jones, of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 2, p. 30. And so Godwin, Southey, &c. &c.

[10] Miss Hannah More, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 254.

"I never knew her *dispense with* her word but once," &c.[1]

"'But I did not know your accommodations were so bad as Joseph tells me they are.' 'T is of no consequence,' said Edmund. 'If they were much worse, I could *dispense with* them for three nights'."[2]

"I am sure your Ladyship will *dispense with* your commands."[3]

---

[1] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 7, p. 310.

[2] Miss Clara Reeve, *The Old English Baron* (ed. 1820), pp. 50, 51.

[3] Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 3, p. 34.

In the first quotation, the sense of *dispense with* is 'go back from', 'break'; in the second, 'excuse', 'put up with'; in the third, 'forgo'.

Like the second quotation is the following: "Adrian . . . . . moved that his want of age for the office of questor might be *dispene'd with*." Jeremy Collier, *The Emperor Marcus Antoninus his Conversation with Himself*, &c. (1701), pp. x., xi.

The phrase *dispense with* means 'part with', in Brathwait, *A Boulster-lecture* (1640), p. 148. In *The Two Lancashire Lovers* (1640), p. 235, *dispense* signifies 'dispense with.'

In the four ensuing passages, *dispense* and *dispense with* have the senses of 'allow by dispensation' and 'grant a dispensation to', respectively.

"Then brast forthe the holy father, Pope Stephen, ... and dyd assoyle Pipine, and *dispense with* him for al the othes whiche he had made," &c. *Of the Olde God and the Newe*, &c. (ed. 1534), sig. G.

"Whether the Pope, *dispensing* all things for money, may be called Pope Penny-father, and, therefore, be suspected of covetousnesse?" *Pasquine in a Traunce* (1566), fol. 108.

"Whether Pope Innocent the eyght, that was utterly ignoraunt and unlearned, might be *dispensed with* to say masse?" *Ibid.*, fol. 108, 109.

"I absolve you of bread and pottage, and *dispense with* you to be never good for anything." Sir Thomas Urquhart, Translation of *Rabelais* (ed. 1694), Vol. 2, p. 190.

Also see the extracts pertaining to *with*, at pp. 263, 264, *infra*.

Suspense, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, occurs for *dispense*.

"And yet, as light and as easie as this punishment is, it may be, and is dayly, *suspensed* withall, for mony; and this is thought to be the best kind of punishment, to punish them by the purse." Phillip *Stubbes, The Anatomie of Abuses* (1585), p. 101 (ed. 1836).

"Rashness was ever a fault, and very *disserviceable* in all the enterprises of human life."[1]

"Mr. Burchell, on the contrary, *dissuaded* her with great ardour; and I stood neuter."[2]

"The irregular feet in each .... represent *dissyllable* feet."[3]

"Why vex my spirit? Why afflict my age
For his *distemperature?* Why rue his sins?"[4]

"Mrs. Delvile received her with the most *distinguished* politeness."[5]

"It now remains, that I return to those more serious and important studies .... from which .... I should never have *diverted*, but from profession, rather than inclination."[6]

"How shall I *do* to answer, as they deserve, your two last letters?"[7]

"I am always to be *documented* by you and your minxes!"[8]

---

[1] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 332.

[2] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 13. The only present meaning of *dissuade*, 'divert by persuasion', is not yet in the dictionaries. "I have tried what is possible to *dissuade* him." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 5, Ch. 3. We parted too lightly with *dehort*, 'try to divert by persuasion', which sense was long borne by *dissuade*, to the ousting of *dehort*, as being superfluous. *Disadvise* I name, but without recommending it.

[3] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 408. At pp. 402, 405, *trisyllable* is an adjective. And so is *monosyllable* in Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 320.

[4] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 65.

[5] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 3, Ch. 7.

[6] Bp. Hallifax, *An Analysis of the Roman Civil Law* (ed. 1795), Preface, p. 23.

[7] Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 3, p. 24. Also see Vol. 1, p. 45. *Do* here means 'contrive', 'manage'.

[8] *Id.*, *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 6, p. 156. Two pages on are *documentations* and *documentize*.

"What, you are *documenting* Miss Nancy, reading her a lecture

"I *doubt* some little difficulty may arise."[1]

"Mrs. Montagu is very well, and wishes you hanged,—a *douceur* which, probably, you might not expect; but, indeed, she expressed it very pathetically."[2]

"Nor sow thy *dowlas* on the satin
Of their pure uncorrupted Latin."[3]

"Soon after this, we were called to a very genteel entertainment, which was *dressed* by Mr. Thornhill's cook."[4]

"If you are *dry*, isn't there the crystal spring?"[5]

"I hear his vessel is just arrived. I *durst* not leave my house."[6]

---

upon the pinched coif, I warrant ye!" Mrs. Susanna Centlivre, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, Act 2.

Also see De Foe, *Captain Singleton* (ed. 1840), p. 310, where *document* means 'school', 'instruct'.

[1] Jeremy Bentham, *Works* (ed. Sir John Bowring), Vol. 4, p. 16. And similarly Gray, Colman, Sheridan, Horace Walpole, Cowper, Cumberland, &c. &c.

"You will have seen the papers; but I *doubt* that they will not contain the latest and most important news." Shelley (1820), *Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 285.

[2] Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 280.

"With a good account of her health, she writes me many *douceurs*, in which you have a great share." Lord Lyttelton (1771), in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 440.

[3] Robert Lloyd, *The North Briton*, No. 26. Add Bickerstaffe, Foote, Miss Carter, &c.

[4] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 32.

[5] Sheridan, *The Duenna*, Act 3, Scene 5. Also see Act 2, Scene 3. And see Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 17.

[6] Mrs. Inchbald, *The Midnight Hour*, Act 2, Scene 1. Also see *The Child of Nature*, Act 1, Scene 3; and Sheridan, *The Duenna*, Act 3, Scene 2, and Act 3, Scene 5.

I add an extract from one of Sheridan's immediate predecessors.

"As for the clergy, no. If I say a word against them, I 'll be shot. I have no desire; and, besides, if I had, I *durst* not, for my soul, touch upon the subject." Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 3, Ch. 20.

But *durst*, as the present, is not peculiar to the language of the last century.

"In short, *each* man's happiness depends upon himself."[1]

"Is any man virtuous? Then he is a traitor; and let him die for it, who *durst* presume to be good, when his prince is bad." Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State*, p. 396.

"But reverend assemblies may make more bold with Scripture than private persons; and, therefore, I confess I 'm so timorous, that I *durst* not follow their example." Glanvill, *Lux Orientalis* (ed. 1682), p. 83.

"So that, if I had no other argument but the style, to detect the spuriousness of Phalaris's Epistles, I myself, indeed, should be satisfied with that alone; but I *durst* not hope to convince everybody else." Bentley, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 91.

Dr. Webster's Editors inform us, that the past participle of the verb neuter *dare* is *durst*. But among what barbarians is 'I have not *durst* do it' good English? Moreover, the preterite of the neuter *dare* has been, optionally with *durst*, *dared*, for two centuries and longer, as I could show from scores of authors. This, too, those Editors, with other lexicographers, are not aware of.

While dealing with the neuter *dare*, I may exemplify a form, almost unrecognized by writers on our language, of its present and preterite, third person singular, often found in old books, as well as in recent.

"But, as for the cercle, he *dare* not, for hys erys, onys put over hys nose." Sir Thomas More, *A Dyaloge* (ed. 1529), fol. 8 v.

"What orchard unrobbed escapes?
Or pullet *dare* walke in their jet?"
Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes*, &c., Ch. 52.

"If men should not goe to lawe, one with another, the courtier would walke up and down, jetting, by the mercer's doore, and wearing his silkes under his nose, which now he *dare* not doe." Dekker, *The Dead Tearme* (1608), sig. C 2 v.

"How pale thou look'st of a suddain! Be not afraid.
He *dare* not come againe to hurt thee."
Lodowick Carlell, *The Deserving Favorite* (1629), Act 4.

"A pretty curr! *Dare* it bite, as well as barke?"
Sir William D'Avenant, *The Cruel Brother*, Act 1.

"Impudence *dare* not deny," &c. Fuller, *Good Thoughts*, &c. (ed. 1830), p. 54.

"One *dare* not light a large candle, except company 's coming in." "You know one *dare* not discover you." Dryden, *The Lying Lover*, Act 4.

"Nobody *dare* come." Viscount Grimstone, *The Lawyer's Fortune*, Act 1.

[' Note in the next page.]

"It ended in a compromise for a fee *each other* time."[2]

"These little *embarrasses* we men of intrigue are eternally subject to."[3]

"Was it for her, a girl of such an age,
To sit at home, *expecting* till a kinsman
Came, nobody knows whence, to marry her?"[4]

"Let us *expostulate* the matter with her."[5]

"Sir John, I understand, is removed into the country, nor *dare* appear to cross me." Theophilus Cibber, *The Lover*, Act 3. Also see Act 2.

"Conversation was intended as a kind of traffic of mental commodities; but nobody now *dare* open their budget." Colman, *The Gentleman*, No. 4.

"Herod of Jewry *dare* not look upon you,
When you are in displeasure."
Henry Brooke, *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act 3, Scene 2.

"Not a servant *dare* stay in his sight; and even the innocent chairs and tables, and everything that comes in his way, feels the effects of his fury." *Id.*, *The Charitable Association*, Act 1, Scene 5. Also see *The Contending Brothers*, Act 2, Scene 8.

Also see Mrs. Inchbald, *The Midnight Hour*, Act 1, Scene 1: James Kenney, *Matrimony*, Act 2, Scene 1: Thomas Dibdin, *The Birth-day*, Act 2, Scene 3: John O'Keeffe, *The Farmer*, Act 1, Scene 1: George Watson, *England Preserved*, Act 4, Scene 2.

"She was silent; for, to rouse her tyrant was more than she *dare* do." "But she went into no trance: she *dare* not." Rev. Charles Kingsley, *Two Years Ago* (ed. 1857), Vol. 1, pp. 214, 215, and p. 298.

"He *dare* not move." "The poor man . . . *dare* not come down." Mr. Charles Reade, *Hard Cash* (ed. 1863), Vol. 1, p. 298; Vol. 3, p. 23.

[1] Sterne, *Letters*, No. 71. This use of *each* for *every*, though common in Scotland and in America, is now un-English.

[2] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 6, p. 363.

"What is a grote or twaine to note,
Once in the life, for man and wife,
To save a pound, in house or ground,
Each other weeke?"
Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes*, &c., Ch. 3.

Every other while once meant 'every now and then', for which we once had *ever now and then*. See Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), fol. 160, 235, with The Preface of Erasmus (*bis*), and fol. 250.

[3] Foote, *The Commissary*, Act 2.

[4] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 260. [5] *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 326.

"Aye, 't was a crying sin, to let such a spirited fine young fellow be kicked out of life by a rascally little *feveret*." [1]

"The areas of the Greek temples were, in like manner, in some instances, *floated* with water." [2]

"Item, a pork-pie, a boiled rabbit and sausages, a *florentine*, a shaking pudding," &c.[3]

"Both appeared quite *flush*, and confident of victory." [4]

"Master Jenkins, you have *fobbed* me finely." [5]

"I fancy he will not be very *fond* of prolonging his visit." [6]

"Are you *fond of* me
For sending you that music girl?" [7]

"I am told, that, even in this very room, a debtor of his, no later than last year, died *for* want." [8]

"You might have rumpled and crumpled, and doubled

---

[1] Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways than One*, Act 4. Spelt *feverette*, the word is used by Miss Carter and Miss Talbot, *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 2, pp. 176, 381.

[2] R. P. Knight, *An Account of the Remains of the Worship of Priapus*, &c. (ed. 1865), p. 54. Also see Addison, *Works* (ed. 1730), Vol. 2, p. 28; Shenstone, *Letters*, No. 32.

[3] Goldsmith, *She Stoops to Conquer*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[4] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 143.

[5] Foote, *The Knights*, Act 2.

[6] *Id.*, *The Nabob*, Act 3. "Nor could I be *fond* that they should see you." Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 5, p. 376. "*Fond of* marrying." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 16.

"Follow, and do not quit him, but seem *fond*
To do him little offices of service."
Otway, *The Orphan*, Act 3.

Also see Gay, *The Beggar's Opera*, Act 3; Mrs. Inchbald, *The Midnight Hour*, Act 3, Scene 1.

[7] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 101.

The *fond* of Foote, &c., means 'desirous'; Colman's *fond of* signifies 'pleased with'.

[8] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 28. Yet we say 'died for want of bread,' &c.

and creased, and fretted and *fridged* the outside of them all to pieces." [1]

"Why, I don't know, master. The neighbours were *frightful*, and would not consent." [2]

"It is no way derogatory *from* the dignity of the crown, or the safety of the public." [3]

"And do not you think I should behave very well, if I was to discharge you my service?" [4]

"You know he was to dedicate his volume of fables to me. So I gave him thirty pounds, to get my arms engraved, to prefix, by way of print, to the *frontispiece*." [5]

---

[1] Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 3, Chapter 4.

[2] Foote, *The Devil upon Two Sticks*, Act 2. Also see *The Commissary*, Act 2.

[3] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 35.

[4] Mrs. Inchbald, *Next-door Neighbours*, Act 2, Scene 1. 'From' is unexpressed.

[5] Foote, *The Patron*, Act 1, Scene 1. *Frontispiece*, used of a book, formerly denoted, as here, its 'title-page'. Richelet gives, as one of the meanings of *tête:* "Le commencement, le *frontispice* d'un livre." His exemplification is: "Cet auteur a fait mettre son nom a la tête de son livre."

"At the least, I am most confident, that I should never suffer to have my name printed in the *frontispiece*, or first leaf of the book," &c. *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 11, p. 12.

Fuller remarks on a spurious imprint of a certain edition of the Bible: "What can be expected from so lying a *frontispice*, but suitable falsehoods, wherewith it aboundeth?" *Mixt Contemplations*, &c., II., 9.

Still older instances are seen in Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 2, Elogium, and p. 27. Also see Milton, *Areopagitica*, p. 50 (ed. 1868); Steele, *The Guardian*, No. 131.

In *A World of Wonders* (1607), the head of its "Epistle Dedicatorie" is called *frontispice*. Hakewill, in *An Apologie*, &c. (1630), styles his title-page, in "The Argument" prefixed to it, *front*.

The term *frontispice* was also used—as by Howell (1619), in his *Familiar Letters* (ed. 1713), p. 11,—of a house; and Brathwait applies it to the face. "Yee worthy women, who have no other device but the dresse of vertue to beautifie your *frontispice*," &c. *The English Gentleman*, &c. (ed. 1641), p. 451.

"Lord bless me, sir! why, there are such steams from savoury pies, such a *fumette* from plump partridges and roasting pigs, that I think I can distinguish them as easily as I know a rose from a pink, or jonquil from a cauliflower." [1]

"There 's a little ragged boy at the hedge-tavern hard by, where I baited my *garran*," &c.[2]

"Whoever supposes that Lady Austen's fortune is precarious is mistaken. I can assure you, upon the ground of the most circumstantial and authentic information, that it is both *genteel* and perfectly safe." [3]

"People who keep lodgings at public places expect to *get by* every one who comes into their purlieus." [4]

"I have contracted to physic the parish-poor *by the great:* but this must be a separate charge." [5]

"Round goes the *griskin* again." [6]

"Were we twenty miles nearer London, I might turn higgler, and serve your Honour with cauliflowers and broccoli at the best *hand*." [7]

"But—but—you don't know—it [the pistol] may go off of its own *head*." [8]

---

[1] Robert Jephson, *Two Strings to your Bow*, Act 1, Scene 3. Also see Garrick, *A Peep behind the Curtain*, Act 1, Scene 2.

[2] Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 2.

[3] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 133.

[4] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 5, p. 178. *Get by* means 'overreach'.

[5] Foote, *The Mayor of Garratt*, Act 1, Scene 1. And so in *The Bankrupt*, Act 3. Also see Steele, *The Spectator*, No. 22: Addison, *ibid.*, No. 505: T. Monro, *Olla Podrida*, No. 3.

"To let out thy harvest *by great*, or by day,
Let this, by experience, leade thee the way.
By great will deceive thee, with lingring it out;
By day will despatch, and put all out of dout."
Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes*, &c., Ch. 46, st. 8.

[6] Murphy, *The Citizen*, Act 1, Scene 2. Also see Thomas Dibdin, *The Jew and the Doctor*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[7] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 195.

[8] Sheridan, *The Rivals*, Act 5, Scene 3. Also see Addison and Steele,

"Mrs. Wildgoose's old *hind*, Stephen, was just gone into the yard with a load of wheat." [1]

"I should be glad you would comply without a quarrel." [2]

"That zeal which *ill* men are always ready enough to exert in opposition to the faith once delivered to the saints." [3]

"You may *immerge* it, replied he, into the ocean, and it will stand." [4]

"These, therefore, have need of the strongest arguments, the plainest proofs, and the most eager *importunacy*, to convince," &c. [5]

"*In* course, . . it must have been the owner of the chestnut, and no one else, who could have played him such a prank with it." [6]

The Tatler, No. 114: Steele, *ibid.*, No. 188; *The Spectator*, No. 479. "He resolved . . . . to do nothing *of his own head*, as we use to say," &c. Heylin, *Ecclesia Vindicata* (1657), Part 2, pp. 354, 355.

"Here is a man who says nothing *of his own head*." Mr. Matthew Arnold, *Literature and Dogma* (1873), p. 175.

[1] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 2, p. 318.

[2] Murphy, *All in the Wrong*, Act 4, Scene 4. "Whatever he produces . . . . I shall be glad you will, at any time, send to me." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 8, Ch. 8. "I shall be glad you will inform me of it." Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 2. In these passages, *if* is omitted.

[3] Jones, of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 1, p. 279. "Cassius was an *ill* man, himself." Richardson, *Correspondence*, Vol. 6, p. 242. "Having kept company with *ill* women." Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees* (ed. 1724), p. 249.

Also see Addison, *The Freeholder*, No. 45.

"In Texas, the word *ill* has the curious signification of 'immoral'; and 'an *ill* fellow' means 'a man of bad habits'." Prof. M. Schele De Vere, *Americanisms*, p. 493.

Why "curious"? *Ill* bore this signification for centuries.

[4] Sterne, *Sentimental Journey*, The Wig. Also see Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote* (ed. 1820), Vol. 2, p. 320.

[5] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, pp. 346, 347.

[6] Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 4, Chapter 27. Also see Kelly,

"It was the odd humour of those days, for the women to pride themselves *in* their chastity, as well as the men *in* their valour." [1]

"Observation may convince us that his power is now *in* the wane." [2]

"He has, sometimes, a striking line, or a shining paragraph; but, *in* the whole, he is warm rather than fervid, and shews more dexterity than strength." [3]

"The first mention which I remember to be made of periwigs, in our English history, is in the account of Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham's appearing in disguise at a ball at Paris, *in* their way to Madrid." [4]

"Cecilia assented, without daring to look at her, and followed, *in* trembling, up stairs." [5]

"I need not instance *in* more particulars." [6]

"A valuable privilege is likewise *indulged* to graduates in this faculty, by the statute-law of the kingdom," &c.[7]

The School for Wives, Act 2, Scene 1: Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways than One*, Act 2.

[1] Bishop Hurd, *Moral and Political Dialogues* (ed. 1760), p. 138. Also see p. 289; and John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 16.

[2] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 44.

[3] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Addison*. Also see Anon., *The Spectator*, No. 292; Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 63.

"There are many others of the Psalms which are, *in* the whole, or in part, very irregular in this respect." Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 425.

[4] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 141. "*At* Paris" is also here noticeable. "She concluded he was *in* the certain road to honour and profit." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 3, Ch. 4. "*In* my way to London." Sir William Jones, *Memoirs*, &c., p. 218.

[5] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 6, Ch. 6.

[6] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 230. We should now write 'instance more particulars'. Also see Jeremy Collier, *A Short View*, &c. (ed. 1730), p. 273: John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, Nos. 2, 8, 28.

[7] Bishop Hallifax, *An Analysis*, &c., Preface, p. 11.

"For his other deviations from the art of writing, I resign him to critical justice, without making any other demand, in his favour, than

"Did not you *inform him*
The bent of my affections?"[1]

"But, when . . . we gravely talk of . . . . . finding out where he *inhabits*," &c.[2]

"Why, the purpose of both is the same, to meet company; *i'n't* it?"[3]

"I shall make no stay here, but *intend* for some of the Electoral Courts."[4]

"In the text, we find the *interchangeable* providences of God suited to the piety or wickedness of his people."[5]

"But there is a gentleman of no good character, an *intimado* of Mr. Lovelace, who is a constant visiter of her."[6]

"I had, indeed, the choice of being keeper of a pest-house; but I was fool enough to withstand the offer, and, all other trades failing, took *into* my present service."[7]

---

that which must be *indulged* to all human excellence." Dr. Johnson, *Preface to Shakespeare.*

[1] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 170.

[2] Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works*, Vol. 1, p. 194. Also see Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 271.

[3] Foote, *The Liar*, Act 1, Scene 2. And so Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 4, pp. 95, 130: *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 3, p. 256. Also see Miss Burney, *Evelina*, Vol. 1, Ch. 23; Vol. 2, Ch. 2: *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 8; Book 5, Ch. 8; Book 9, Ch. 1.

[4] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 8, p. 351.

And so Franck has the verb active *intend*, for 'intend to go to'. *Northern Memoirs* (ed. 1694), p. 175.

Design for has, likewise, been used for 'design to go to'.

"Asclytos *design'd for* Naples the same day." Wilson, Burnaby, & Co., *The Works of T. Petronius Arbiter*, &c. (ed. 1710), p. 20.

"My spirits fail me; I am very low; and I am *designing for* the bath, as my last resource." Dr. Young (1757), in *Correspondence of Richardson*, Vol. 2, p. 40.

Also see Lord Lansdowne, *The She-gallants*, Act 1: De Foe, *Captain Singleton* (ed. 1840), p. 222.

[5] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 312.

[6] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 7, p. 359.

[7] Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 3.

"I 'll on with my *jemmies*. None of your black bags and jack-boots for me." [1]

"Olivia would be drawn as an Amazon, sitting upon a bank of flowers, dressed in a green *joseph*," &c. [2]

"Bless me, Mr. Carmine, don't mind my shape this bout; for I 'm only in *jumps*. Shall I send for my tabbies?" [3]

"The fiend, with a *jut* of his foot, may keep off the old," &c.[4]

"'Did you fall, in going home, Sir?' 'Ay, ay, plump in the *kennel*'." [5]

"But nothing could now exceed my confusion, upon seeing the gentleman and his *lady* enter." [6]

"The *lambs'-wool*, even in the opinion of my wife, who was a connoisseur, was excellent." [7]

"You must know that I have .... a good many bets depending on the same *lay*." [8]

"Harry let down the *leaf* of his hat, and drew it over his eyes, to conceal his emotions." [9]

"How much might she earn in a day, then, by her *leasing*?" [10]

---

[1] Foote, *The Englishman in Paris*, Act 1.

[2] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 16.

[3] Foote, *Taste*, Act 1. By *jumps* is meant "a sort of boddice, used instead of stays." Foote has *tabby*, for 'padding', in *The Knights*, Act 2.

"Tight stays, they find, oft end in humps,
And take, too late, alas! to *jumps*."

Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 306.

Also see John O'Keeffe, *The Farmer*, Act 2, Scene 2.

[4] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 2, Ch. 3. [5] *Id., ibid.*, Book 2, Ch. 9.

[6] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 19. Also see Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 7; Book 2, Ch. 7.

[7] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 11. A beverage is here intended.

[8] Colman, *The Genius*, No. 3.

[9] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 4, p. 210.

[10] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 2, p. 255. *Leasing* here means 'gleaning'.

"He was to *lie* that night at a neighbour's, to whose child he was carrying a whistle." [1]

"Introduced! I'd as *lief* be introduced to Old Nick." [2]

"I thought that had detected Love, that sly *lurcher*, lurking under the mask of confidential." [3]

"I was led to trouble you with these observations, by a passage which, *to speak in lutestring*, I met with, this morning, in the course of my reading." [4]

"This fellow would turn rake and *macaroni*, if he was to stay here a week longer." [5]

"The *machine* started within a few minutes of the time appointed; the coachman smacked his whip," &c.[6]

---

[1] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 6. Also see Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 7, Ch. 8.

[2] Gen. Conway, *False Appearances*, Act 5, Scene 1. "I had as *lieve* she had lived." Sheridan, *The Duenna*, Act 1, Scene 3.

[3] Foote, *The Cozeners*, Act 2.

Lurcher, the name still borne by a species of dog, is only another form of *lurker*. Compare *church* and *kirk*, *poach* and *poke*. In East Anglia, a *perch* for birds is called a *perk*. In its proper sense, *perk* has, however, no etymological connexion with *perch*. *Vide infra*, p. 248.

[4] *Letters of Junius*, No. 48.

[5] Garrick, *Bon Ton*, Act 1, Sc. 1. Also see Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 8; Book 8, Ch. 3: Mrs. Cowley, *Who 's the Dupe?*, Act 2, Sc. 2. "There is, indeed, a kind of animal, neither male nor female, a thing of the neuter gender, lately started up amongst us. It is called a *macaroni*." Colman (1770), *Prose on Various Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 88. Also see Vol. 3, p. 190.

[6] Southey, *Espriella's Letters from England*, Vol. 2, pp. 48, 111. *Machine* here means 'coach'. Also see Colman, *The Genius*, Nos. 2, 5; *Terræ Filius*, No. 3: Miss Carter, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 1, p. 391: Burke, *Correspondence*, Vol. 1, p. 372.

Diligence, also, was the name of an English coach, with those who called it a *machine*. "I enclose a line to Johnson, to tell him, that, if, in the mean time, and while you are absent from town, another parcel of the proof should be ready for revisal, I wish him to send it hither by the *diligence*." Cowper (1781), *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 102, 103.

Diligence was shortened, too. "*Forlis.* I did not come on horseback, sir. *Abbé.* In the *dilly*, perhaps? They are very convenient now." Gen. Conway, *False Appearances*, Act 2.

"The actions, sentiments, conversation, of the heroes and heroines of ancient days were as unnatural as the *machines* employed to put them in motion." [1]

"A draught of ale, friend; for I 'm *main* dry." [2]

"Away, you *malapert!* Your frowardness
Had well nigh been my ruin." [3]

"On going up Snow-Hill, I observed *a* pretty *many* people assembled," &c.[4]

"He did not *matter* cold nor hunger." [5]

"This roused the tinker's choler, already provoked at Tugwell's amorous freedom with his doxy; and he gave him a clink in the *mazard*." [6]

"In the next place, his method of stating a *medium* of six years of war, and six years of peace, to decide this question, is altogether unfair." [7]

"I have a *metalline* mirror, found in Herculaneum, which is not above three inches square." [8]

"We shall finish this chapter with a few *miscellany* observations." [9]

---

[1] Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Preface to the second edition. We should now say *machinery*.

[2] Foote, *The Knights*, Act 2. Also see Bickerstaffe, *The Maid of the Mill*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[3] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 195.

[4] Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c. Vol. 3, p. 185. "*A* pretty *many* miles." Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 2. "*A* pretty *many* years." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Act 2; *The West Indian*, Act 2, Scene 3. Also see Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 2, p. 256.

[5] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 91. It occurs often in this work, as in Vol. 1, p. 149, &c. &c. Also see Franck, *Northern Memoirs* (ed. 1694), p. 157: Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 2, p. 65; Vol. 4, pp. 171, 229; Vol. 5, p. 163: *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 7, p. 67.

[6] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 154.

[7] Burke, *Observations on a late 'State of the Nation'*.

[8] Bishop Lowth, *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Notes, p. 68. Also see Dr. Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 9.

[9] James Harris, *Hermes* (ed. 1771), p. 257.

"As Mr. Burchell had hinted to us, the day before, that he was making proposals of marriage to Miss Wilmot, my son George's former *mistress*," &c.[1]

"We must sometimes gratify the *mobile*."[2]

"What *mockado* is this to such a poor soul as I!"[3]

"I have a *mort* to communicate to you on different subjects."[4]

"After drinking half a pint of *mountain* together at the next tavern, we finished our contract."[5]

"Don't you give yourself any trouble about their *mutining*."[6]

"When thus a *mutton*, statelier than the rest,
A ram, the ewes and wethers sad addressed."[7]

"The princesses then revealed to Hippolita their *mutual* inclination for Theodore," &c.[8]

---

[1] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 7.

[2] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 24.

[3] Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 2, p. 37.

[4] Sterne, *Letters*, No. 130. Add Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 1, p. 11: Bickerstaffe, *Love in a Village*, Act 1, Scene 5: Sheridan, *The Rivals*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[5] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 7. See Mrs. Susanna Centlivre, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, Act 3.

"Why, Numskull, that 's nothing. Her ladyship's wine
All over the village runs just like a fountain;
And I heard the folks say, every dish, when they dine,
Will be swimming in claret, madeira, and *mountain*."
Charles Dibdin, *The Deserter*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[6] Charles Johnson, *Chrysal*, Vol. 3, p. 81.

[7] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 10, p. 40.

[8] Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Ch. 4.

Dr. Johnson, defining *mutual* by "reciprocal, each acting in return or correspondence to the other," quotes two passages professedly in exemplification of this definition. The first is from Shakespeare, who says that the cattle of a herd "make a *mutual* stand," on hearing the sound of a trumpet. The second is from Pope: "a *mutual* flame," between two persons. But, as to the first, how can a "stand" be "reciprocal", save by interrelation to another "stand"? What second "stand" is contemplated, "acting in return or correspondence *to*" *the* one mentioned? It is not from reciprocation that the "stand"

"The muleteer, . . . entering into a long conversation, as how he was chief gardener to the convent, . . . and as

takes place, but because of the trumpet's acting on the cattle conjointly. A second definition is, therefore, required, to cover the *mutual* of the passage in question. And the sense which it has there, though now, except in Scotland, a vulgarism, once was very current.

"But neither hath a lot any power of it selfe, neither can any man by his owne will, or many men by their *mutuall* consent, give any such power unto it, as," &c. Thomas Gataker, *Of the Nature and Use of Lots* (ed. 1627), p. 360. Also see pp. 73, 91.

"Those daughters of Scedasus of Leuctra, ... conceiving a *mutuall* sorrow for their lost virginity, became resolute actors in their owne tragedy." Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, &c. (ed. 1641), p. 341.

"No solace could transport them so highly, nor seaze on them so hotly, wherein, with joint affections, they did not partake *mutually*, and which, with a vertuous temper, they allayed not mildly." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 405.

"The inconveniences of an unequal yoak, or marrying of a Christian with an infidel, were innumerable: the society and conversation could not be so *mutual* between them; the Christian woman could not keep those correspondences which were of the interest of her religion;" &c. Hamon L'Estrange, *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), p. 292.

"Whereas I always stay till the parties . . . are *mutually* desirous of an agreement." Fuller, *Mixt Contemplations*, &c., II., 12.

"There the soldier, the tradesman, the merchant, ... have laid aside their names of distinction, and calmly conspir'd in a *mutual* agreement of labors and desires." Bp. Sprat, *The History of the Royal Society*, &c. (ed. 1667), p. 427.

"Even the torments of the damned . . . will receive a vast accession of misery and woe from the *mutual* weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth." Bentley, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 276.

"The intimate connexion which I have had with the Royal Academy ever since its establishment, the social duties in which we have all *mutually* engaged for so many years," &c. Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works*, Vol. 2, p. 181.

"Our *mutual* friend, John Bourke." Burke, *Correspondence*, Vol. 2, p. 251.

Sterne, too, has the expression "*mutual* friend." See his *Works* (ed. 1819), Vol. 4, p. 169. Also see The Earl of Corke, *The World*, No. 47: Colman, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 211: Cumberland, *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 381: Thomas Dibdin, *The Jew and the Doctor*, Act 2, Scene 1.

how she had got a white swelling by her devotions, and

In our own time, Mr. Benjamin Disraeli has written of "their *mutual* ancestors." *Lothair*, Ch. 12.

That *mutual* was once felt to be ambiguous appears from the way it was sometimes qualified. "There is a *mutual reciprocal* correspondence." Bishop Andrewes, *Ninety-six Sermons* (ed. 1841—1844), Vol. 1, p. 395.

William Webbe, in 1586, used *mutual* for 'alternate'. "*Mutuall* interposition." "The sixt kinde is called a round, beeing *mutuallie* sung betweene two: one singeth one verse, the other the next; eche rymeth with himselfe." *A Discourse of English Poetrie*, in *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2 (1815), pp. 54, 59. Also see pp. 64, &c.

Feltham has *intermutual*, *intermutually*, and *intermutualness*. *Resolves*, &c. (ed. 1628), Second Centurie, pp. 49, 197, 244.

The subjoined anomalous uses also deserve notice.

"The expense of children may, possibly, be urged as an objection to this scheme. But I answer, that children will, of necessity, come, whether our ballad-singing ladies are married, or not; and, while the parents are *mutually* travelling with the younger at their backs, the elder will, in all probability, be able to walk." Anon., *The World*, No. 149.

Here, "*mutually* travelling" is for 'travelling in one and the same manner'.

"The *mutual* fear of the Captain's resentment to me, and of her own to him, neither of which would have any moderation, deterred me." Miss Burney, *Evelina*, Vol. 2, Letter 2.

For other bad uses, by Miss Burney, of *mutual* and *mutually*, see her *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 3; Book 5, Ch. 7; Book 6, Ch. 1 and 4.

Nor would one, now-a-days, write, without liability to reproof, as Southey writes: "I have always admired that passage in the Iliad, where Diomede and Glaucus meet in battle, and turn aside by *mutual* consent." *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, p. 524. Compare the passage from Gataker, given above.

Though Mr. Dickens wrote *Our Mutual Friend*, and not at all with any intention to accredit the expression which he chose for his title, he had used a similar expression in sober earnest; and, in the collective edition of his works, he let it pass.

"But he now regretted it the less, inasmuch as it afforded him an opportunity of acknowledging, before *their mutual friends*, that he loved Mr. Wardle's daughter deeply and sincerely," &c. *Pickwick* (ed. 1868), p. 476. "A *mutual* friend." *Ibid.*, p. 343.

Dr. Webster's editors teach as follows: "*Common* is applied to that which belongs alike, or *in common*, to the parties concerned; as 'our *common* country', 'a *common* friend'. *Mutual* implies an *interchange*

what a *nation* of herbs he had procured, to mollify her humour," &c.[1]

"Miss, he 's so *near*, it 's partly a wonder how he lives at all."[2]

"It [the scenery] *neighbours* nearly, and as nearly resembles, the scenery of Catfield; but with what different perceptions does it present me!"[3]

"As for that, I don't want friends, *neither*, I believe."[4]

"Adelaide . . opens a clothes-press, takes from her head a hood, scarf, and *night-rail*," &c.[5]

"She *noddled* her head, was saucy, and said rude things to one's face."[6]

"He mentioned a thousand copies as a *numerous* impression."[7]

---

of the thing spoken of between the parties; as '*mutual* friendship'. Hence, to speak of 'a *mutual* friend' (as if a friend could be interchanged) is a gross error; while it is proper to speak of having 'a *mutual* desire' to promote the interests of 'a *common* friend', or those of 'our *common* country'."

Mutual, we are here told, denotes 'interchange'. If so, how, unless *interchange* denotes 'community', can there be a *mutual* desire to promote the interests of a country? For it is not implied that the country responds to a desire like that of which it is the object.

[1] Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 7, Ch. 21. "Lunnun is a *naation* rum place." "This made me *naation* riled." *Giles's Trip to London* (Norwich, 1871), pp. 6, 9. Here the word is an adverb.

[2] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 2, Ch. 9. "I am not a *near* man, neither; but, as to giving at that rate, it 's quite out of character." *Id., ibid.*, Book 9, Ch. 1. This *near* is 'penurious'. The *partly* in the first quotation seems to be oddly equivalent to 'altogether'. Such a use of the word, in the speech of the illiterate, once was very common.

Near, as used above, is old. See Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 107.

[3] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 219.

[4] Mrs. Inchbald, *I 'll Tell you What*, Act 1, Scene 3.

[5] John O'Keeffe, *The Prisoner at Large*, Act 1, Scene 6. Again in Act 2, Scene 1, and Act 5, Scene 2.

[6] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 222.

[7] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Pope*. "They would, in any *numerous* school, have obtained praise, but not excited wonder." *Id., Life of Milton.*

"Plautus, in his richest vein of humour, is *numerous* and poetical."[1]

"Hark ye, David! Take this mummy into the cellar, and wet his dust with a cup of *october*."[2]

"Mrs. Burke has not profited *of* the bathing."[3]

"The mind which has feasted on the luxurious wonders of fiction has no taste *of* the insipidity of truth."[4]

"Safe, and, *of* consequence, bold as Dymoke, he has no enemy but himself to combat."[5]

"Ah, Mrs. Graves, said I, I fear you have had a very troublesome guest *of* me."[6]

"Adam's discourse *of* dreams seems not to be the speculation of a new-created being."[7]

"I have never set eyes *of* her once."[8]

"His mother was now better, and had taken pity *of* his suspense and impatience," &c.[9]

"Here, my Lord, you have fortune *of* your side."[10]

"Oh, plague *of* your obedience!"[11]

---

[1] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., Preface, p. 4.

[2] Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 3. *October* signifies 'cider'. And see Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 5, p. 110.

[3] Burke, *Epistolary Correspondence of Burke and Dr. Laurence*, p. 57. Also see p. 186; and *Correspondence*, Vol. 4, p. 422.

[4] Johnson, *Preface to Shakespeare*.

[5] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 1. Also see Cowper, *The Connoisseur*, No. 134.

[6] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 240. "Ah, Sam, Sam, I have had a heavy loss *of* you, since I parted with you to that young rogue of a master." *Id.*, *The Marriage-contract*, Act 2, Scene 1. "It is true, Madam, you have not the luckiest partner *of* me." Anon., *The Humours of Whist* (ed. 1743), p. 42. "Mr. Monckton will really have a great loss *of* her, when she dies." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 6.

[7] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Milton*.

[8] Foote, *The Commissary*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[9] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 10, Ch. 6.

[10] *Letters of Junius*, No. 41.

[11] John O'Keeffe, *The Prisoner at Large*, Act 2, Scene 3.

"Even he, with all his penetration and experience,—*of* which old folks generally pique themselves,—could not perceive his drift." [1]

"Then let a musician be admitted *of* the party." [2]

"Yet it cannot be said, that his genius is ever unprovided *of* matter, or that his fancy languishes in penury of ideas." [3]

"He remitted *of* his assiduity." [4]

"Mason is in Yorkshire now; but I missed *of* him." [5]

"They don't value damnation *of* a farthing." [6]

"Mr. Whitfield then conducted Wildgoose . . . to several different people, ... who were for the independence not only of each congregation *on* other churches, but of every individual *on* each other." [7]

"Every right action is registered in Heaven, and there remains, independent *on* the wrong uses that may be made of it by those for whose benefit it was designed." [8]

"I was struck all *on* a heap, for my part." [9]

"His flock will never be persuaded, that such an one

---

[1] Sterne, *Letters*, No. 129.

[2] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 111.

"We also use *of*, instead of *on* or *upon*, in the following familiar phrases, which occur chiefly in conversation: 'to call *of* a person', and 'to wait *of* him'." Priestley, *The Rudiments of English Grammar*, &c., p. 97.

Of these uses of *of* I am not supplied with instances from books.

[3] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Dryden*.

[4] Charles Johnson, *Chrysal*, Vol. 1, p. 252.

[5] Gray, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 302.

[6] Foote, *The Nabob*, Act 2. "For my part, I value none of the modern fashions *of* a fig-leaf." Mrs. Susanna Centlivre, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, Act 3.

[7] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 2, p. 18.

[8] Miss Carter, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 1, pp. 133, 134. Also see Johnson, *Rasselas*, Ch. 38: Hawkesworth, *The Adventurer*, No. 10.

[9] Sheridan, *The Duenna*, Act 2, Scene 2.

sets himself *on* work, either out of love to them, or hatred to sin."[1]

"Besides, it is the *onliest* method to keep her to one's self."[2]

"It has a kind of *oratorial* number or measure."[3]

"Being all *outbreathed* in turns, they remitted from their toil."[4]

"My lord's servants call you an old *out-of-fashioned* codger, and have taught me what 's what."[5]

"The case, as here described, is similar to that of the bag of a *pair of bagpipes*," &c.[6]

---

[1] Bishop Warburton, *A Selection*, &c., p. 351.

[2] Foote, *A Trip to Calais*, Act 1. "It is the *onliest* way to rise in the world." "In short, it is the *onliest* liquor of life." *Id.*, *The Orators*, Acts 1 and 3.

There is an old use of *only* which I am unable to exemplify at first hand. "In conversation, I do not say the most polite, we sometimes hear the word *only*, which is a diminutive, joined to the superlative degree; as 'He is *only* the *cleverest* fellow I ever saw'." Priestley, *The Rudiments*, &c., p. 57. Compare *alone*, for 'out and out', spoken of in note 9 to p. 46, *supra*.

[3] Bishop Lowth, *Isaiah*, Preliminary Dissertation, p. 2. Also see Warton, *The Adventurer*, No. 105: and Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 92.

[4] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 209.

[5] Garrick, *Bon Ton*, Act 2, Scene 1. This odd compound seems to have had a certain vogue for more than a single generation. See Gay, *Polly*, Act 2: Warburton, *Tracts*, &c., p. 104: Fielding, *Love in Several Masques*, Act 3, Scene 5. In the same play, Act 4, Scene 2, Fielding has *out-of-fashion*.

[6] Godwin, *An Enquiry*, &c., p. 319.

Dr. John Nott, in his edition of *The Gull's Hornbook*, remarks: "Wherever I have seen the word *virginal* or *virginals* occur, it has always been spoken of as one instrument, and explained as a smaller sort of spinet. Decker is the first writer I have met with who mentions a *pair of virginals*. It only proves that we have but an imperfect knowledge of the instrument."

The inference that a *pair of virginals* was a double instrument is hasty. I might quote passages from old authors, for *a pair of*, in application to *beads*, *cards*, *chaplets*, *gallows*, and *organs*.

"The only return he received . . . was a small pension for himself, and a *pair of colours* in the Guards for me." [1]

"He saw his friend begin to *palate* his wine with pleasure." [2]

"Damn the city! I wish the *papishes* would set fire to it again." [3]

"I have two French prints hanging in my study, both on Iliad subjects; and I have an English one in the *parlour*, on a subject from the same poem." [4]

"Lady Ruelle . . . had been something *particular*, as I fancied, in her behaviour to me." [5]

"'But tell me', continued Mr. Fenton, 'were there any prisoners of consideration among the confined debtors?' 'A few, sir, of note, and many who had been well to *pass* in the world.'" [6]

---

[1] Charles Johnson, *Chrysal*, Vol. 4, p. 156.

[2] *Id., ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 204.

[3] Murphy, *The Citizen*, Act 1, Scene 2.

"And they say he's a *papish*, too, forsooth." Cowley, *Cutter of Coleman-street* (1663), Act 2, Scene 8. *Papish* is for *papist*.

"Perhaps I was once a *papish*; but, since that, like most of the world, I 'm converted to no religion at all." Viscount Grimstone, *The Lawyer's Fortune*, Act 3, Scene 4.

Also see Steele, *The Tatler*, No. 31 : Gray, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 83 : Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 165 ; Vol. 2, pp. 45, 140.

It is not much more than a century since the old *papalin* fell out of use. It is employed by Bishop Lavington, in *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared* (1747), pp. 183, 339, 363 (ed. 1833).

Our old *popeling*, like *papalin*, was taken, doubtless, from the Italian *papalino*.

[4] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 7. In England, people who have a drawing-room no longer call it a *parlour*, as they called it of old, and till recently.

[5] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 2, p. 80. The signification of *particular*, in this passage, is 'marked' or 'peculiar.' Also see Foote, *The Englishman Returned from Paris*, Act 1, *ad fin.*

[6] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 3, p. 84. See Mabbe, *The Rogue*, Part 1, p. 251 ; and Dr. Hornbeck, in *Sadducismus Triumphatus* (ed. 1727), p. 496.

"Why, I han't been at it *passing* a couple of months," &c.[1]

"To be sure, your *peaching* them, who first drew them in, is not so very just."[2]

"The prim squat clump is *perked* up exactly on the top of every eminence."[3]

"I was *petted* at their neglect of us during our long illness."[4]

"The Callender, right glad to find
His friend in merry *pin*,
Returned him not a single word,
But to the house went in."[5]

"To hear a sweet goldfinch's sonnet,
This morning I put on my bonnet,
But scarce in the meadow, *pize* on it!
When the captain appeared in my view."[6]

"I love to *pleasure* my friends."[7]

"The extracts will be as *plenty*—and as valuable—as blackberries."[8]

"In a great *plurality* of examples, I trust he will be perfectly convinced, that no design or contrivance whatever has been exercised."[9]

---

[1] Foote, *The Commissary*, Act 2.

[2] Charles Johnson, *Chrysal*, Vol. 1, p. 167. *Peach*—in many oldish books written *'peach*,—is a shortening of *appeach*. Compare *pert*, from *apert*.

[3] Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., p. 215.

[4] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 46.

[5] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 309.

[6] O'Keeffe, *The Farmer*, Act 1, Scene 2. "What a *pize!*" Richardson, *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 6, pp. 179, 298, &c.

[7] Foote, *The Patron*, Act 2, Scene 2. I have by me similar extracts from Colman, Murphy, &c. Lord Macaulay, in our own time, has attempted, but vainly, to revive this old use of the verb *pleasure*, for 'favour', 'accommodate'.

[8] T. J. Mathias, *The Pursuits of Literature*, Note on I., 227.

[9] Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, Ch. 1. As in this extract, *plurality* was *long used* where we should use *majority*.

"You will always, said he, be getting a *power* of money." [1]

"I am jealous of Edmund's *preferable* regard for you." [2]

"Even Mrs. Delvile evidently desired her absence; since, whenever the journey was talked of, she *preferably* addressed herself to any one else who was present." [3]

"Sir George *prevents* every wish. He must make the best of husbands." [4]

"He beareth a very profligate character as to women, .. and is Mr. Lovelace's more especial *privado*." [5]

"You, Lord Mansfield, did not understand me so; and, I *promise* you, your case requires an abler defence." [6]

---

[1] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, Dedication, p. 20. Also see Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 1, p. 48; Vol. 3, p. 9: Murphy, *The Upholsterer*, Act 1, Scene 3: Gray, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 113: Frederic Philon, *He would be a Soldier*, Act 1, Scene 1: Mrs. Godwin, *Posthumous Works* (1798), Vol. 3, p. 17.

[2] Miss Clara Reeve, *The Old English Baron*, p. 143. Richardson abounds with this use of *preferable*.

[3] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 6, Ch. 9. Also see Richardson, *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 2, p. 136.

[4] Mrs. Inchbald, *Next-door Neighbours*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[5] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 7, p. 359.

[6] *Letters of Junius*, No. 68. "He must have more striking features to catch me, I *promise* you." Goldsmith, *She Stoops to Conquer*, Act 1, Scene 1. Also see Garrick, *Neck or Nothing*, Act 1, Scene 1: Colman, *The English Merchant*, Act 3, Scene 1; Act 5, Scene 1. Fifty more references might be added.

Nor is this use of modern origin.

"'Well,' quoth he, 'I *promise* you I, for my parte, had lieffer to bee the first or the chief man here, then the seconde manne in Roome'." Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), fol. 267.

"And so I commit you to your supper, and myselfe to my litter; for I *promise* you I am not a little weary with gambolling this afternoone." *Maroccus Extaticus* (1595), p. 20 (ed. 1843).

"*Wil.* I am content. But do you heare me, sir?
Did not Sir Raph Smith aske ye for a wench?
Phil. No, I *promise* thee; nor did he looke
For any but thy selfe, as I could gesse."

Henry Porter, *The Two Angrie Women*, &c. (1599), p. 97 (ed. 1841).

"Although that, in the time of day, it is warm enough at Rome,

"Good morning t' ye, Doctor. Doctor Feelove, good morning. How *are* your *pulse* to-day?"[1]

"Mrs. Talbot is *pure* well, and really bears up surprisingly."[2]

"He has picked up again *purely*, since his misfortune," &c.[3]

"I must humour this old *put*, in order to be remembered in his will."[4]

"I think a gentleman ought not to *put up* tamely one or two severe things that the Colonel has said."[5]

"Don't go to *put upon* a silly old man."[6]

"And there he told me I was to run, and to double and *quat*; and there he was to catch me, and all that."[7]

"Mrs. Mechlin has *reason*."[8]

---

yet the nights, I *promise* you, are very cold and very unfriendly." *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 12, p. 37.

"Il vous aime de tout son cœur, *je vous le promets*." This expression is censured by M. Wey, *Remarques sur la Langue Française*, Vol. 1, p. 332.

[1] Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways than One*, Act 1. But *pulse*, as a plural, is of venerable age.

"He could eate nothing; so, by little and little, hee consumed away; and, after *some few puls*, he died." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 22.

[2] Miss Jeffries, *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 198. Also see Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 2, p. 75.

[3] Gray, *Correspondence of Gray and Mason*, p. 288.

[4] Murphy, *Three Weeks After Marriage*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[5] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 7, p. 340. And so in *Pamela*, Vol. 2, p. 291.

See, further, Addison, *The Tatler*, No. 93.

"She 's the quietest woman that ere I knew; for, good heart, she 'll *put up* anything." Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, *Patient Grissil* (1603), Act 3, Scene 2.

Compare *do away*, spoken of at p. 267, *infra*.

[6] Bickerstaffe, *The Maid of the Mill*, Act 3, Scene 3.

[7] Foote, *The Author*, Act 2. See Mabbe, *The Rogue*, Part 2, p. 282.

[8] Foote, *The Commissary*, Act 3, Scene 1. Also see *The Lame Lover*, Act 3, Scene 1.

"What, you are a courtier, I *reckon*. No wonder you wish the press was demolished."[1]

"He is a very licentious translator, and does not *recompense* his neglect of the author by beauties of his own."[2]

"No time should be lost. So get away, and furnish yourself immediately with a *regimental*. You must be very smart and fashionable."[3]

"When the light of the Gospel was *relumined* by the Reformation," &c.[4]

"I hope, dearest madam, you are equally careful to *reposit* proper memorials of all that happens to you and your family; and then, when we meet, we shall tell our stories."[5]

"Unnumbered and imperceptible chinks, fissures, and crannies of our *rimose* and *rimpled* carcasses," &c.[6]

"In the last list, I presume, you *roll*?"[7]

"The Miss Flamboroughs . . . understood the jig and the *roundabout* to perfection."[8]

"I was . . three times in the *round-house*."[9]

"On the second day, his brown horse, Orator, took *rust*, ran out of the course, and was distanced."[10]

"What Mr. Lovelace saw of the house,—which were the *saloon* and the parlours,—was perfectly elegant."[11]

---

[1] Foote, *The Bankrupt*, Act 3. This use of *reckon* is very common with Foote. Also see James Kenney, *Raising the Wind*, Act 1, Scene 2: Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 130.

[2] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Stepney*.

[3] Gen. Conway, *False Appearances*, Act 3, Scene 2.

[4] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 168.

[5] Johnson, *Letter to Mrs. Thrale*, Sept. 30, 1773.

[6] Leycester, *Olla Podrida*, No. 19.

[7] Foote, *The Liar*, Act 1, Scene 1. *Roll* here signifies 'be enrolled'.

[8] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 9.

[9] Foote, *The Minor*, Act 1, Scene 1. *Round-house* is one of the old words for 'lock-up'.

[10] Colman, *The Gentleman*, No. 5.

[11] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 3, p. 352. The 'best drawing-

"If I fine them for their irregularities, it shall be in a much more moderate sum than forty shillings, or any other *sconce* imposed by the proctors."[1]

"[She] paid my bill the next week, without *sconcing* off sixpence."[2]

"He cried, I will, I will once more *seek to* my God."[3]

"But Sir James Melvil was too well *seen* in courts to have used this language, if he had not understood it would be welcome."[4]

"It is like those poisonous wild gourds which, being *shred* amongst other wholesome herbs," &c.[5]

"If we offer up a petition to a temporal prince, we do it in as few, honourable, and *significative* words as the thing will bear."[6]

---

room' is here meant by *saloon*. Also see Colman, *The Gentleman*, No. 5.

Mr. Marsh writes of "all grades of society, from the wigwam to the *saloon*", and of making "books and journals speak the dialect of the *saloon*". *Lectures on the English Language*, pp. 291, 440. In England, hair-dressers have their *saloons*; and there are, also, billiard-*saloons*, &c. &c. But I do not know where, among English-speaking people, *saloon* is the name now given to any room in a private house.

[1] Colman, *Terræ Filius*, No. 1.

[2] Foote, *The Devil upon Two Sticks*, Act 2, Scene 1. Also see Warton, *The Idler*, No. 33: Colman, *Terræ Filius*, No. 2. And see the foot of p. 133, *supra*.

[3] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 4, p. 108. See I. Kings, 10, 24.

[4] Bishop Hurd, *Moral and Political Dialogues*, p. 211, foot-note. *Seen* here has its old sense of 'versed'.

"All you that faine would learne the perfect waie
To have your child in musicke something *seene*,
Aske nature, first, what thereto she doth saie,
Yer further sute ye make to such a queene:
For, doubtlesse, grossum caput is not he
Of whom the learned muses seene will be."

Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes*, &c., Instructing of Children.

[5] Jones, of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 2, p. 289.

[6] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 338.

"In the style of the lady's note to you I can easily perceive a *smatch* of her character."[1]

"Why, you know you never laugh at the old folks, and never fly at your servants, nor *smoke* people before their faces," &c.[2]

"Who the devil could think that he would *smoke* us in this disguise?"[3]

"Besides, sir, in this town, people are more *smoky* and suspicious."[4]

"Mr. Gibbon shews, it is true, *so* strong a dislike to Christianity, *as* visibly *disqualifies* him for that society of which he has created Ammianus Marcellinus president."[5]

"I warrant your master is only in a *sound;* and I 've a bottle of stuff in my pocket, that will fetch him in a whiff."[6]

"He loved me with passion; and, as I could not pay him in *specie*, I endeavoured to supply my want of affection to him by my attention and assiduities."[7]

---

[1] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 155. Also see Vol. 8, p. 156.

[2] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 6, Ch. 11. Also see James Kenney, *Raising the Wind*, Act 2, Scene 2.

[3] Kelly, *The School for Wives*, Act 3, Scene 5. Add Goldsmith, Foote, Charles Johnson, Charles Dibdin, &c. Also see Massinger, *The City Madam*, Act 3, Scene 1: Dryden, *An Evening's Love*, Act 4.

[4] Foote, *The Liar*, Act 1, Scene 1. Also see *The Englishman in Paris*, Act 1; and *The Commissary*, Act 1.

"Igad, I don't like his looks. He seems a little *smoky*." Vanbrugh and Colley Cibber, *The Provoked Husband* (1728), Act 3. See, further, Steele, *The Spectator*, No. 320.

[5] Porson, *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis*, Preface, p. xxviii.

In the following extract, *so . . . as* is constructed with the preterite.

"She complied in a manner *so* exquisitely pathetic, *as moved* me." Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 24.

[6] Bickerstaffe and Foote, *Dr. Last in his Chariot*, Act 3.

[7] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 223.

"You must pay him in *specie*, Madam,—give him love for his wit." Dryden, *An Evening's Love*, Act 5.

Here we have the older and less restricted use of the expression.

"*Species*, your honour knows, is of easier conveyance." [1]

"He affirms, that, from the year 1726 to the year 1784, there was coined, at the mint of France, in the *species* of gold and silver, to the amount of about one hundred millions of pounds sterling." [2]

"This needle had been a glover's, of approved metal, keen and polished, and three-*square*, toward the point, for a quick and ready penetration of tough leather." [3]

"How an evasive, indirect reply will *stand with* your reputation . . is worth your consideration." [4]

"Whoever weds Isabella, it shall not be Father Falconara's *start-up* son." [5]

"I have one half of the house to myself . . while . . the two musty nieces are *stived* up in the other half." [6]

"So I find they are all in a *story*." [7]

"How *strange* you make of this matter!" [8]

---

[1] Garrick, *Neck or Nothing*, Act 2, Scene 2.

[2] Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. "The *species* of coin." Jeremy Collier, *Essays upon Several Moral Subjects* (ed. 1705), Vol. 3, p. 182.

We owe our *specie* to the Latin phrase *in specie*. In like manner, our *effigy* is due to *in effigie*, as our ancestors once wrote, while they put *effigies* as the nominative. It does not appear that we may account similarly for the obsolete *ambage* and *compage*. Instead of our *in pontificals*, the old expression is *in pontificalibus;* but *pontificalibus* was too long to be naturalized as English. Contrast *omnibus*.

[3] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 1, p. 192. See *Newes out of Purgatorie* (1590), in *Tarlton's Jests*, &c. (ed. 1844), p. 73: Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State* (ed. 1841), p. 9.

[4] *Letters of Junius*, No. 68.

[5] Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Ch. 4.

[6] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 7, p. 131.

[7] Sheridan, *The Duenna*, Act 2, Scene 3. *Story* is here put for 'plot'.

[8] Charles Dibdin, *The Deserter*, Act 1, Scene 2.

"But he, as if hee had not knowne mee, or had not given him any such thing at all, *made* so *strange* of it, that hee made me to suspect that, according to the custome of that country, hee had drunke a cup too much, and so might happely have forgot it." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 2, p. 335.

"He gave me the *strappado* on my shoulders, and the bastinado on the soles of my feet."[1]

"You are not a little beholden to the poor dear soul that 's dead, for putting a *streak* in your ladder, when you was on the last step of it."[2]

"Accordingly, the *sublime* of Homer, in the hands of Pope, becomes bloated and tumid, and his description tawdry."[3]

"I cannot but marvel to see you *make* so *strange* of an expression not only frequent in Scripture, but common and usual in every language." Joseph Mede (1629), *Works* (ed. 1664), p. 922.

Another old expression, somewhat similar, may aptly be exemplified in this place. "It [paralepsis] is also very many times used, for a good pollicie in pleading or perswasion, to *make wise* as if we set but light of the matter," &c. Puttenham, p. 194. See, for another instance, p. 252.

[1] Bickerstaffe, *The Padlock*, Act 1, Scene 2.

[2] Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 3. *Streak* here means 'rung' or 'round'.

[3] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 182. Here we have a sample of a species of Gallicism which struggled long, but unsuccessfully, for naturalization. Even in our own century, writers of note have used like expressions; but they are now ventured by none except the very affected.

"So that it was only a civil and political worship, in the legislators, and had very little of *sacred*, even among the vulgar." Bentley, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 306.

"His model may be excellent; but the copy will be ridiculous. This *ridicule* does not arise from his having imitated," &c. Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works*, Vol. 1, p. 161. And *ridicule* is so used by Addison, in *The Spectator*, No. 18.

"The *incomprehensible* of Love." Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 39.

"They are the shadowy *obscure* and fearfully *anomalous* of physical nature, the *lawless* of human nature." Coleridge, *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare*, Vol. 1, p. 240.

"We will return, at some future time, to the *metaphysical* of the language." Landor, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 164.

"Not to insist on the *prosaic* of the passage, we may inquire who could be suspicious, or who could know anything about his wit and subtilty." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 69.

"Byron, often impressive and powerful, never reaches the *heroic*

"The fencing-schools were, of necessity, much resorted to by your gallants, and *such* of the commonalty *who* aped their manners, as tavern-waiters," &c.[1]

"Oh my Thais, welcome!
How does my *sweeting?*"[2]

"He vainly hoped that his *sycophant* court-language would be echoed back in the address."[3]

"The life of man
Is like a game at *tables.*"[4]

"But here the common proverb *takes place*, that charity begins at home."[5]

"He *took notice* to his friends of the king's conduct."[6]

"And draw'st the *taplash* of another's brains."[7]

"When I sallied forth, the moon was darting her *temperated* rays through the shade that surrounded the cottage, tipping the tops of the venerable oaks with silver."[8]

"Then, throwing her *teresa* aside, upon my soul, she is prodigious fine," &c.[9]

---

and the *pathetic* of these two poems." *Id., The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 278.

The sublime, the obscure, &c., not followed by *of*, are accounted good English. *Ridicule*, for 'ridiculousness', is a Gallicism of a different order.

[1] Dr. John Nott, in his edition of *The Gull's Horn-book* (1812), p. 154, note 7.

[2] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 101.

[3] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 46.

In the prose of the last century, many words now exclusively substantives were used adjectivally; as *bombast, coquet, harlot, neighbour, patriot, scoundrel*, &c. &c. And *vide supra*, p. 227, note 3.

[4] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 265.

[5] Bishop Warburton, *A Selection*, &c., p. 350. *Takes place* here signifies 'is applicable'.

[6] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Waller*. *Took notice* here means 'made mention'. And so Richardson, *passim*, Henry Brooke, Colman, &c. &c.

[7] Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 157.

[8] Mr. Berkeley, *Olla Podrida*, No. 37. Also see Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 17.

[9] Foote, *The Lame Lover*, Act 3.

"Other critics have taken the text of Horace in the same sense *that* I have here considered it." [1]

"For all the Jesuits had got the cholic, and to *that* degree, *as* never was known in the memory of the oldest practitioner." [2]

"I will give you a few lessons shall set you up for a fine gentleman in a minute." [3]

"I am come to taste your good cheer, and pass an evening with you over a *tiff* of punch." [4]

"A tour to Tyburn in a *tim-whiskey* and two would have concluded your travels." [5]

---

[1] Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 97. Also see p. 111.

[2] Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 7, Ch. 39.

Slightly different is the construction in the following passage, where *that . . as*—the *as* being expressed or understood,—is followed by the infinitive.

"Mrs. Rivers behaved with *that* sweetness and affability *as to gain* almost the adoration of the whole family." Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 299.

"I never was *that* romantic fool *to imagine* there can be happiness where there is not independency." Frederic Philon, *He would be a Soldier*, Act 2, Scene 1.

"The demonstrative *that* is sometimes used, very emphatically, for 'so much'. 'But the circulation of things, occasioned by commerce, is not of *that* moment *as* the transplantation which human nature itself has undergone.'

"Sometimes this same pronoun is elegantly used for 'so much' or 'such a'. 'Some of them have gone to *that* height of extravagance, *as* to assert',' &c. Priestley, *The Rudiments*, &c., p. 63.

It may be doubted whether either of these modes of expression was, in Priestley's time, regarded as elegant. At all events, they are thorough vulgarisms, now-a-days; just what one would look for in the writings of scholars like Mr. Dickens. See *Dombey and Son* (ed. 1848), p. 472.

[3] Cumberland, *The Choleric Man*, Act 2, Scene 2.

The omission of the relative pronoun is observable in this passage.

[4] Cumberland, *The Brothers*, Act 2, Scene 5. Also see Warton, *The Idler*, No. 33: Foote, *The Capuchin*, Act 1.

[5] Foote, *The Cozeners*, Act 1. Also see Colman, Prologue to *The Suicide*. Burke has *jim-whiskee*. *Correspondence*, Vol. 1, p. 182.

"Of time, on all occasions, he was an exact computer, and knew the minutes required *to* every common operation." [1]

"You have a good appetite *to* what you eat?" [2]

"'T is evident, and I can plainly see,
He has no stomach *to* a wife." [3]

"He had the assurance, last winter, to court a tradesman's daughter in the city, with two thousand pounds *to* her fortune, and got me to write his love-letters." [4]

"You shall have Nancy *to* your wife, as I promised you." [5]

"He flattered himself that she would not only acquiesce with patience *to* a divorce," &c.[6]

"I may lose five and twenty thousand pounds by their acquiescence *to* this breach of faith in the Spaniards." [7]

"I think *to go* to Tunbridge for a fortnight." [8]

"It has been said, already, that the article has no meaning but when associated *to* some other word." [9]

"But, to the deformer,—a name too often synonymous *to* the improver,—it is not necessary that his trees should have attained their full growth." [10]

---

[1] Dr. Johnson, *Life of Swift.*

[2] Bickerstaffe and Foote, *Dr. Last in his Chariot*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[3] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 326.

[4] Garrick, *High Life Below Stairs*, Act 1, Scene 2.

[5] Murphy, *Three Weeks After Marriage*, Act 2. And see Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 171.

[6] Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Ch. 1.

[7] *Letters of Junius*, No. 4. Also see Dr. Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 150; and Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, Ch. 5. Colman has "acquiescence *with*." *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 108.

[8] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 4, p. 295.

[9] James Harris, *Hermes*, p. 224. Also see Aaron Hill, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 157.

[10] Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque*, &c., p. 219.

"So doth the law accept it in this oath, where it makes it equivalent and synonimous *to* the wordes which are joined with it," &c. Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), p. 389.

"What the devil is *toward* now?"[1]

"Hush! I hear Captain Cape's voice. The hideous *tramontane!*"[2]

"Would you believe it, that perverse hussy, Lucy Waters, who left me but this minute, threatens to *transverse* all my hopes, and is gone this instant to Sophia, with that resolution?"[3]

"But 't is all *tritical*, and most *tritically* put together."[4]

"This, however, did not happen till it was *turned of* eleven; and then he judged it of the latest to intrude upon them."[5]

"*Tyranness* in your turn, accuse others of your own guilt."[6]

"Accept our *unalienable* love to you both."[7]

---

[1] Henry Brooke, *The Contending Brothers*, Act 1, Scene 3. Again in Act 3, Scene 1. Also see *The Charitable Association*, Act 2, Scene 4.

"Your cousin, the marquess, and all your guests, are at hand; and I see no meat *towards*." Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, *Patient Grissil* (1603), p. 70 (ed. 1841). Also see Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame*, p. 48.

"I 'm sure there 's mischief *towards*." Sir John Vanbrugh, *The Mistake*, Act 5.

"But, as ill fortune would have it, there was some pastry *toward*," &c. Mr. Ruskin, *Aratra Pentelici* (1872), p. 30.

[2] Murphy, *The Old Maid*, Act 2, Scene 1. Also see Gay, *Polly*, Introduction: Vanbrugh and Colley Cibber, *The Provoked Husband*, Act 1: Steele, *The Tender Husband*, Epilogue.

"Is *tramontane*, and stumbles all belief," writes Cowper, using the adjective. *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 183. And so Steele, *The Tatler*, No. 222.

[3] Cumberland, *The Brothers*, Act 2, Scene 1.

[4] Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 6, Ch. 11.

[5] Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 5, p. 27. "'My dear', says he, 'aw, you came home very late, last night.' 'T was but just *turned of* two', says I." Vanbrugh and Colley Cibber, *The Provoked Husband*, Act 3.

[6] Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 2, p. 239. Also see pp. 4, 27, 59.

[7] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 258. And Cowper has *unfrequency*, *unfrequent*, *unpolite*, *untractable*.

"The vocation in time comes to be thought mean and *uncreditable*." [1]

"Don't be *under* any surprise." [2]

"The Penaloas brought, this evening , . . . one of the most *ungain*, conceited professors of the art of murdering I ever met with." [3]

"The Phœnicians, who spoke a harsh and *untuneable* dialect, were unacquainted with fine poetry, and, consequently, with poetical ideas." [4]

"You see I am become a mere usurer, and want to make *use* upon *use*." [5]

"It renders the habit of society dangerously *valetudinary*." [6]

"But, really, these thick walls are enough to inspire the *vapours*, if one never had them before." [7]

"Really, that old moat and drawbridge are enough to *vapour* him to death." [8]

"I shall presently see landscapes beautifully diversified with . . plains of plush, valleys of *velveret*," &c.[9]

"She proceeded to remark, that they who had *warm* fortunes were always sure of getting good husbands." [10]

---

[1] Paley, *Sermon*, Sept. 21, 1782.

[2] Cumberland, *The Brothers*, Act 4, Scene 3.

[3] Beckford (1787), *Italy*, &c., Vol. 2, pp. 92, 93. Also see Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 9, Ch. 3 : Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 1.

[4] R. P. Knight, *An Account of the Remains*, &c., p. 91. Also see Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 1.

[5] Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 2, p. 389. Also see Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 5.

[6] Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*.

[7] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 6, Ch. 2.

[8] *Id., ibid.*, Book 6, Ch. 7. "[You were] a little *vapoured*, I thought, yesterday." *Id., ibid.*, Book 1, Ch. 10. Also see Frederick Philon, *He would be a Soldier*, Act 1, Scene 3.

[9] George Canning, *The Microcosm*, No. 22. Also see Southey, *Letters*, &c. (Bristol, 1797), p. 11.

[10] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 16. In the same chapter, farmer Williams is called "a *warm* man". This is a favourite phrase

"She had been brought to bed, that day *was a month*, of a very fine boy." [1]

"You would much sooner be taken for her *washwoman*." [2]

"If dame Winifred was here, she'd make 'em all out with a *wet finger;* but they are above me." [3]

"Perhaps there is not a fault but *what* may take shelter under the most venerable authorities." [4]

---

with the miserly Mr. Briggs, in Miss Burney's *Cecilia*. Also see James Kenney, *Raising the Wind*, Act 1, Scene 1: John O'Keeffe, *The Farmer*, Act 2, Scene 4: Coleridge, *Literary Remains*, Vol. 1, p. 293. *Warm*, in these cases, means 'affluent'. The vulgar still use it.

[1] Foote, *The Cozeners*, Act 2. And here I may mention *sennight*, for 'week', only recently obsoleted.

[2] Miss Burney, *Evelina*, Vol. 1, Letter 14. Also see Vol. 3, Letter 18.

[3] Foote, *The Knights*, Act 1. "A porter might fetch him with a *wet finger*." Dekker, *A Knights Conjuring* (1607), p. 19 (ed. 1842). The meaning is 'with ease'.

Dr. John Nott, in his edition of *The Gull's Hornbook* (1812), betrays that the phrase "with a wet finger" was unknown to him in modern use. I am sure I have met with it fifty times in the literature of the last century. For instances, by Thomas Edwards and Samuel Richardson, see the *Correspondence* of the latter, Vol. 3, pp. 15, 173. Also see Bishop Lavington, *The Moravians Compared and Detected* (1755), p. 80.

Dr. Nott further thinks, as to "with a wet finger", that "indeed, it is not improbable but the expression may be purely Deckerian"; and *dunstical*, he conjectures, is "a word perhaps of the author's coinage; for I find it nowhere else" but in Dekker.

Both terms were, certainly, established before Dekker wrote.

"There is added, also, a large & plain table, in ordre of the A. B. C., whereby to the name of any persone, or to any good matier in the booke conteined, readie waye and recourse maye *with a weat fynger* easily bee found out." Udall, *Apophthegmes* (1542), To the Reader, *ad finem*.

Dunstical is used by Nash, in *Pierce Penilesse*, &c. (1592), p. 40 (ed. 1842).

[4] Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works*, Vol. 1, p. 112.

"Not a writer is now extant that mentions his name, but *what* tells the story of him." Bentley, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 214.

"There is not a note in the gamut but *what* tends to heighten and

"There is nothing so ridiculous, or, rather, profane, *which* pious writers will not say for the sake of a witty allusion. Thus, the learned Bishop Taylor says, that Christ was born at the sign of the Star, in Bethlehem." [1]

"You may think it too soon to form an opinion of the future government; yet it is impossible to avoid hazarding some conjectures, when everything *whispers me* that names, not principles, are changed," &c.[2]

"I, for my part, do heartily *wish* you may not be deceived." [3]

---

inflame my wife's lunacy." Colman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, No. 128.

"He observed that no virtue was able to resist his arts and assiduity, and that scarcely a farmer's daughter, within ten miles round, but *what* had found him successful and faithless." Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 3.

"The abbot cannot be humbled, but *what* the community must be humbled in his person." Sir Walter Scott, *The Monastery*, Ch. 10.

"Not a thing stolen, but *what* the sea gave it up again faithfully." Dr. J. H. Newman, *Lives of the Saints*, St. Paulinus, p. 102.

This gross vulgarism much surprises one in Dr. Newman. It is still frequent in inferior writers. Lord Lytton, *The Caxtons* (1-vol. ed. 1856), pp. 115, 257, 263, 357: *What will He do with it?* (ed. 1859), Vol. 1, pp. 187, 301, 325; Vol. 2, pp. 54, 95, 321; Vol. 3, p. 321; Vol. 4, p. 10: *A Strange Story* (ed. 1862), Vol. 2, p. 226: *The Coming Race* (6th ed., 1872), p. 289. Rev. Charles Kingsley, *Two Years Ago* (London ed. 1857), Vol. 3, p. 279. Mr. Charles Reade, *Hard Cash* (ed. 1863), Vol. 3, p. 22: *Griffith Gaunt* (ed. 1866), Vol. 2, p. 89: *Put Yourself in His Place* (ed. 1870), Vol. 2, p. 50.

[1] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 42, foot-note.

[2] Mrs. Godwin, *Posthumous Works* (1798), Vol. 4, p. 50. And so Miss Burney, Horace Walpole, &c. &c.

[3] Gray, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 199. "I *wish* thou art not already too familiar with the wicked ones." Mrs. Susanna Centlivre, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, Act 5. "I *wish* I don't love him at last." Richardson, *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1811), Vol. 4, p. 256. This is a very common use with Richardson; and I find it in Sterne, Miss Carter, Burke, &c. &c. "I *wish* they don't half kill him by their ridiculous fondness." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 6, Ch. 5.

It must be confessed, that we have dealt strangely by *hope*, in making it serve the office of *wish*, in instances like those quoted.

"*J'espère* que votre santé *est* bonne. Vous voilà content, *je l'espère*."

"The station to which the chief direction of such a work properly belongs, is filled *with* a person endowed, beyond any other of this age, with all the abilities," &c.[1]

"Let me have a roast turkey, plump and full-breasted, his craw full *with* marrow." [2]

"When he shall see what frippery a woman is made up *with*, what a pasticcio of gauzes, pins, and ribbons go to compound that multifarious thing, a well-dressed woman; why then, why then,—what was I going to say?" [3]

"Come, come, my lord, a truce *with* your reflections on my niece!" [4]

"One commission, however, I can't dispense *with* myself from executing." [5]

These locutions are condemned by M. Wey, *Remarques sur la Langue Française*, Vol. 1, p. 332.

As between the French and ourselves, on whose part has there here been imitation? Or has there been none on either?

[1] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 90, note 2.

[2] Robert Jephson, *Two Strings to your Bow*, Act 2, Scene 2.

[3] Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 1. "But you have heard of our neighbours, Honestus and Furiosa,—he a peaceable man, and she made up *with* discord," &c. Viscount Grimstone, *The Lawyer's Fortune*, Act 1.

[4] Colman, *The Jealous Wife*, Act 3, Scene 1. *Id.*, Prologue to *A Wife in the Right*. Also see Charles Macklin, *Love à la Mode*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[5] Foote, *The Minor*, Act 2, Scene 1. Also see Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 1, p. 218; Vol. 3, p. 222; Vol. 5, pp. 111, 208. "As the term begins this day, I should wish to be dispensed *with* in general, but will wait upon you, if you think proper, on any particular occasion, to call me into court." Arthur Murphy, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 503.

One of the old meanings of *dispense with*, applied to a person, as above, is 'exempt', 'excuse', 'absolve'. With the same sort of regimen, the simple verb *dispense*, in the same sense, is perfectly good English; and yet Dr. Webster's Editors know nothing of it.

"He appeared to think himself born to be supported by others, and *dispensed* from all necessity of providing for himself." Dr. Johnson, *Life of Savage*.

"This is, at least, the rule of history; and, if poetry should only deviate from it for the sake of making the fable one, connected, mar-

"Here she meets with such excellent pennyworths, that, as my pantry is stored with more provisions than we can dispense *with*," &c.[1]

"And then he went on *with* sharpening his knife."[2]

"For more than a year, Scott has cut *with* the Edinburgh Review."[3]

---

vellous, heroic, and answering to our notions of justice, I do not see how the poet is *dispensed* from it in this instance." Gibbon, *Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 125, 126.

"To *dispense* us from this painful necessity, authority ought carefully to be invested with a sort of magic persuasion." Godwin, *An Enquiry*, &c., p. 506.

"This materialism . . . . allows its disciples to talk, and *dispenses* them from thinking." Shelley, *Essays*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 226.

"The orders of the directors furnished him with the means of effecting his purpose, and *dispensed* him from the necessity of discussing the matter with his Council." Lord Macaulay, *Essay on Warren Hastings*.

"As he could not be *dispensed* from residence, he had no option but to sell the living at once." Dr. J. H. Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. 1, p. 414. Also see *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851), p. 173.

[1] Colman and Thornton, *The Connoisseur*, No. 91.

[2] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 2, Ch. 1.

[3] Southey, *Selections* from his Letters, Vol. 2, p. 110.

A last-century use of *with* is thus noticed by Priestley: "The preposition *with* is, also, sometimes used, in conversation, to express a degree of quality something less than the greatest; as, 'they are *with* the widest'." *The Rudiments*, &c., p. 55.

Similar phrases, in which we have substituted *of* for *with*, are of the oldest. For two, from Udall (1542), see my Additions.

"There had she such cheare as farmers houses affoord, who fare not *with* the meanest." Henrie Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame* (1592), p. 57 (ed. 1841).

"And, although he was cut off in the middle course and principall strength of his age, yet, in respect of honour and fame, he lived *with* the longest, having, in all parts, fulfilled the measure of true nobilite." Sir John Haywarde, *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the IIII.* (1599), p. 2.

"Till he be ready to rise, which, I presume, will not bee *with* the soonest, I prethee let me intreat thee to goe a little way with a servant of mine," &c. James Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 235.

"Neverthelesse, excuse me, if I tell you, sir, that your hat doth flap

"We feel not the sudden damps his spirit is often seized *withal*." [1]

"Wildgoose could not forbear fixing his eyes upon a small oval picture of a young lady, in a gilt frame, that was fixed in a panel *withinside* of the door." [2]

"Ay, marry, you are well off. 'T is no worse than you expected. But I am a *woe* woman this heavy day, I am sure." [3]

"It is not to be *wondered*, that Christianity hath made no greater progress." [4]

---

a little on the one side thereof. The brims are *with* the largest. Cause them to be cut more narrow." *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 6, p. 4.

Philemon Holland, in the passage which follows, put the comparative after *with*.

"Yea, he essayed, first before all others, to vault and mount on horsebacke, to shoot, also, and dart from his horse. Went he, any time, away *with* the worse? Very pleasant he was, and laughed at himselfe most of all." *The Cyrupædia* (1632), p. 12. "Went he," &c., is to render ἡττώμενος δὲ αὐτός.

Like 'with the meanest', &c. are the Latin *cum primis*, *in primis*. Also compare the Hebraism ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, *in excelsis*; and δι' ἐγγυτάτου, Thucydides, 8, 96.

Dr. Abbot produces a single instance similar to those which I have quoted,—"*with* the least," from Ben Jonson; and this he hastily explains as signifying "something like, very near, the least." See *A Shakesperian Grammar* (ed. 1871), sec. 195.

[1] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 325.

[2] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 182.

[3] Henry Brooke, *The Female Officer*, Act 2, Scene 3.

[4] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons*, &c., p. 88. Also see his *Isaiah* (ed. 1778), Prelim. Dissert., p. ix.

Milton, *Areopagitica* (ed. 1868), p. 36. De Foe, *Moll Flanders* (ed. 1840), p. 306. Bishop Hurd, *Moral and Political Dialogues*, &c., p. 307. Mrs. Inchbald, *The Wise Man of the East*, Act 2, Scene 2. Dr. Newman, *Lives of the Saints*, The Family of Sir Richard, &c., p. 70. Also *vide supra*, foot of p. 201.

"Nor is it at all to be *admired*, if men fancy something rash," &c. Lord Preston, *Boetius* (1695), p. 187. Also *vide supra*, p. 210, note 4.

"It is *consented* to admit him again, and *watched* to entrap him." Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, p. 355.

And here it is appropriate to remind of modes of spelling, now altered, which prevailed only a very few generations ago;[1] and also of words imported from abroad, of which the old forms, as in the case of *busto*,[2] *caricatura*,[3] *rotund*,[4] *souse*,[5] and *visto*,[6] differ from those now in vogue.

Intermediate between the English which I have been treating of, and English of recent emergence, stands that which is obsolescing. A few examples of phrases, and senses of words, belonging to this category, here follow.

"To shew my uncommon civility, I *advertise* my reader,

Marvelled has been used in the same way. Bacon, *Essays*, No. 44, *Of Deformity*. Gataker, *Of the Nature and Use of Lots*, &c. (ed. 1627), p. 346.

"It is *pretended*, that the company may expect," &c. Colman, *Terræ Filius*, No. 2.

[1] Such as *allay* for *alloy*, *assay* for *essay*, *essay* for *assay*, &c. &c. Obsolete modes of spelling, and those of pronunciation, I cannot, however, undertake to treat of.

[2] "A *busto* stands near them, to denote Sculpture." James Harris, *Three Treatises* (ed. 1765), p. 375. Also see Dr. Joseph Warton, *The Adventurer*, No. 59.

[3] "I shall be stuck up in *caricatura* in all the print-shops." Goldsmith, *She Stoops to Conquer*, Act 4, Scene 1. Also see Dr. Joseph Warton, *The Adventurer*, No. 133: John Frere, *The Microcosm*, No. 9: George Canning, *ibid.*, No. 18.

[4] "They are going, likewise, to build a *rotund*, to terminate the *visto*." Shenstone, *Letters*, No. 47.

[5] This is the old corruption of *sous*, the French coin. Its pronunciation at so late a period as 1781 is seen from this couplet:

"With broken Funds our Monarch meets the House:
His Board of Works have left him scarce a *souse*."

Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 229.

[6] "They might see a long, dull, dreary, unvaried *visto* of despair and exclusion, for half a century, before them." Burke, *Speech on the Economical Reform*, 1780. Also see John O'Keeffe, *The Prisoner at Large*, Act 1, Scene 4.

that I shall impartially transcribe every argument in your favour that has come to my knowledge," &c.[1]

"It was boldly affirmed, that innumerable miracles *approved* the peculiar virtues of the practice which was thus introduced," &c.[2]

"So far as this hypothesis may be accepted, the ground of the difficulty is done *away*."[3]

"*By* what I have heard of his character, I fear it affords no very comfortable prospects for our poor Princess."[4]

"He is known, however, to have written several things that have appeared as anonymous; and I fancy, now, soon we shall see something *considerable* from him."[5]

"The learned Le Fevre wrote a most elegant *copy* of Latin verses, execrating the flute and all the commentators on it."[6]

"A short time, I hope, will *discover* the generosity of his sentiments, and convince you that my opinion of him has been more just than yours."[7]

---

[1] Porson, *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis*, p. 53.

[2] Southey, *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, pp. 490, 491. Also see p. 95.

[3] Paley, *Natural Theology*, Ch. 26. Also see Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 360: Southey, *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, p. 302.

[4] Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 164.

[5] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 8, Ch. 8. "Before I proceed, a remark may be made here, which our good old writers would have called *considerable*." Southey, *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, p. 22. Also see Landor, *Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 163, 164.

[6] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., Preface, p. 33.

[7] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 17. Also see Dr. Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. 2, p. 439.

A very common old sense of *discover*, namely, 'explore', 'examine', is not recorded by our dictionary-makers. Every reader of early voyages and travels, in particular, must know it well.

"She laie a slepe upon her backe, with her handes cast over her hedde,—as, for the moste parte, yong women are wont to doe,—so that forthwith the yong Prince *discovered* her from toppe to toe." Barnabe Riche, *Farewell to Militarie Profession* (1581), p. 102 (ed. 1846).

"In this same yeere, 1500, it is reported, that Gasper Cortereal craved a generall licence of the king Emmanuel to *discover* the New

"Could any poor creature write such stuff, unless one lately *eloped* from Bedlam?" [1]

"Mrs. Sarsanet, it seems, under whose protection Miss Townsend had placed herself, after her imprudent *elopement* from her father, had some business at Bristol fair." [2]

"I make little doubt but Noah was glad, when he was *enlarged* from the ark; and we are sure that Jonah was, when he came out of the fish; and so was I, to escape from the good sloop the Harriet." [3]

"Cecilia, who had no difficulty in knowing this pretended school-master *for* Mr. Gosport, was readily beginning," &c.[4]

"He . . . . . spared not *for* warmth of expression, to alarm her delicacy, or add to her displeasure." [5]

---

found land." *The Discoveries of the World*, &c. (1601), p. 96 (ed. 1862).

"Such a one was Julius Cæsar, who, in Britain, a country *undiscovered*, peopled with a valiant nation, begun a war in autumn," &c. Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State*, p. 308. Also see Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), p. 31; *Essays*, &c. (1676), VII., p. 1.

"God commanded Moses to send twelve men to *discover* the land of Canaan." Jeremy Collier, *Essays upon Several Moral Subjects*, Part 4 (ed. 1725), p. 146.

"These rules, then, I will take for sure grounds, and use them as a land-compass, in the *discovery* I now intend." Joseph Mede (1613), *Works* (ed. 1664), p. 370.

"And that there is an America of secrets, and unknown Peru of nature, whose *discovery* would richly advance them, is more than conjecture." Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), pp. 131, 132.

"Now, to judge whether the ancients or moderns can be probably thought to have made the greatest progress in the search and *discoveries* of the vast region of truth and nature, it will be worth inquiring," &c. Sir William Temple, *Miscellanea*, Part 2, p. 9.

[1] John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 19. "He *eloped* from his friends," &c. Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 1, Ch. 2. Also see Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, Vol. 2, p. 88.

[2] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 2, p. 13.

[3] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 160.

[4] Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 2, Ch. 3.

[5] *Id., ibid.*, Book 3, Ch. 6.

"She not only became reserved to me, in order to recommend herself more effectually to our *gouvernante*, but," &c.[1]

"The music struck up, and, playing so loyal a piece of music, no one had the *hardiness* to interrupt them."[2]

"My good intentions towards you . . . are continually frustrated . . . . . by mere *impertinencies*, such as calls of civility from persons not very interesting to me," &c.[3]

"And here it will not be *impertinent* to observe, that," &c.[4]

"You will not, I hope, forget to send them time enough to be inserted in the volume."[5]

"With your natural turn to equity, and *knowing*, as you are, in the doctrine of precedents," &c.[6]

"The dwarf *had like* to have been killed more than once."[7]

"I collect the articles of news from the other papers, and make new ones for the postscript, translate the *mails*, write occasional letters from Cato and Theatricus, and give fictitious answers to supposed correspondents."[8]

---

[1] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 114. Also see Cowper, *The Connoisseur*, No. 119: Mrs. Inchbald, *The Midnight Hour*, Act 1, Scene 1.

[2] Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, Vol. 1, p. 201. Also see Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 361.

[3] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 235. Also see Mr. De Quincey, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 252.

[4] Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection* (ed. 1854), p. 108. Also see Southey, *Vind. Eccl. Angl.*, p. 81: Mr. De Quincey, *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 50, foot-note.

[5] Cowper, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 351. *In* is omitted here. Also see Colman, *The Genius*, No. 9.

[6] *Letters of Junius*, No. 68. Also see Johnson, *The Adventurer*, No. 137.

[7] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 13.

[8] Colman, *The English Merchant*, Act 1, Scene 1. *Id.*, *The Genius*, No. 4.

"Let a man be *never* so wicked himself, yet," &c.[1]

"In proportion as acknowledgments are warmly and vividly given, they are *obnoxious* to this possible imputation," &c.[2]

"But this we leave, as foreign to our work, and drawing us into a theory which merits a better place than an *occasional* note."[3]

"A gentleman told me, that, when he had once gone far from his own island, one of his labouring servants predicted his return, and described the livery of his attendant, which he had never worn at home, and which had been, without any previous design, *occasionally* given him."[4]

"However, the task proved so difficult, that, when I had gone through a part of it, I remitted *of* my diligence," &c.[5]

"'T is true, Lord Dartford's proposals to Miss Herbert render him unworthy my alliance," &c.[6]

---

[1] Bishop Lowth, *Sermons and Other Remains*, p. 300.

[2] Joseph Richardson, *The Fugitive*, Advertisement. And see Jeremy Bentham, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 23.

"Do you prefer a Gallicism, or a Latinism? However, you shall have both. 'Not *obnoxious* to Clodius's law', for not 'amenable', 'liable', or 'subject'," &c. Landor, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 158.

It is very eccentric to assert, that there is anything of foreign idiom here.

[3] James Harris, *Three Treatises* (ed. 1765), p. 367.

[4] Dr. Johnson, *A Journey*, &c., Ostig in Sky.

The lexicographers do not distinguish the two senses of *occasional* and *occasionally*. The prevailing modern sense, 'now and then', is no novelty.

"Such as these famous mirrors shall wee *occasionally* encounter withall, in our readings." Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, &c., p. 449.

[5] Mason, *The Art of Painting*, &c., Preface.

[6] Joseph Richardson, *The Fugitive*, Act 5, Scene 5. *Of* is here omitted. "Not *unworthy* the antagonist of Dryden." Johnson, *Life of Pope*. Also see *The Rambler*, No. 180. "*Worthy* the regard

"Her country, and the other marks
Of her *original*, she neither knew,
Nor, from her age, was 't possible she should."[1]

"As my first wish, in attempting a play, was to avoid every appearance of *plagiary*," &c.[2]

"Is that so wonderful? And do you *think*
To find a woman without any fault?"[3]

"It tends to familiarize the mind *to* those strict and severe principles of judging," &c.[4]

"But, chiefly, I was struck to see that he suffered Sir Clement, who *stayed supper*, to sit between us."[5]

---

of", &c., *Id.*, *ibid.*, No. 82. "Who are *unworthy* protection." Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 20. "*Worthy* attention." Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Literary Works*, Vol. 2, p. 84.

[1] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 80.

[2] Sheridan, *The Rivals*, Preface.

[3] Colman, *The Comedies of Terence*, &c., p. 323. Also see Miss Hannah More, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 278: Cumberland, *The Natural Son*, Act 4: Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways than One*, Acts 3 and 4.

[4] Godwin, *The Enquirer*, p. 184. Also see pp. 235, 362.

[5] Miss Burney, *Evelina*, Vol. 3, Letter 11. "We intended to stay the farce." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 1, Letter 20. "She would not *stay their rising* in the morning." *Id.*, *Cecilia*, Book 9, Ch. 4. Also see Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. 4, p. 296: Anon., *The World*, No. 77: Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 3: Colman, *The Genius*, No, 15: Beckford, *Italy*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 101.

"So the Duke and the rest of the lords departed, except the Earle of Darby, who *stayed supper* with the King," &c. Sir John Haywarde, *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the IIII.* (1599), p. 26. Also see p. 38.

Till and *for* have sometimes been omitted after 'stay'.

"*Stay quarter-day* he never can abide,
But takes up rent upon the highway-side."
Samuel Rowlands, *The Four Knaves*, p. 55 (ed. 1844).

"Do yee heare, daughter? You shall *staye my leasure*."
Henry Porter, *The Two Angrie Women of Abington* (1599), p. 34 (ed. 1841).

"*Brisac.* And how does your daughter? *Lewis.* Ready for the houre,
And like a blushing rose that *staies the pulling*."
Fletcher, *The Elder Brother*, Act 2, Scene 1.

"Yet still the honest man went forward without suspicion, and grew rich, while I still continued *tricksy* and cunning, and was poor, without the consolation of being honest."[1]

"Having *staid the Queen's safe delivery*, ... he set forward," &c. Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (ed. 1656), p. 193.

Also see Heylin, *The History of Episcopacy* (1657), Part 2, p. 378.

[1] Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Ch. 26.

The formation of *tricksy* is observable; the word exemplifying the rare suffix *-sy*, which, perhaps, consists of *s* euphonically prefixed to the adjectival *-y* of *roomy*, for instance. *Tricksy* is, then, *trick* + *-sy*. *Tipsy* I would take, similarly, from the now provincial *tip*, 'draught of liquor', and not go afield, with Dr. Webster's Editors, to find its base in the Swiss *tips*. *Tipple* is the frequentative, or else the diminutive, of *tip*. So we once had *huggle*, from *hug*. See Stubbes, *The Anatomie of Abuses*, p. 100. *Ringle*, from *ring*. Tusser, *passim*. *Scantle*, from *scant*. Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, &c., pp. 123, 270. Add *gruntle*, from *grunt*.

The schoolboy's *cozy* doubtless sprang from *cocky*; and *kicksy-wicksy*, from *kicky-wicky*. Again, as a friend suggests to me, *doxy*, instead of being referable to the Danish *dukke*, may have started from the vernacular *ducky*, and so consist of *duck* + *s* + *y*,

But we are not yet at the end of words presumably embodying a euphonic *s*.

Idlesby. Whitlock, quoted by Archdeacon Todd.

Lewdsby. *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings*, &c. (1594), fol. 31 v.

Rigsby. *A World of Wonders* (1606), The Epistle, &c., sig. A 2 r.

Rudesby. Used twice by Shakespeare.

"You are a *rudesby*, yourself," writes, in 1774, Mrs. Catherine Clive, in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 604.

Sneaksby. Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 8; Vol. 3, p. 330. Dekker, in his *Satiro-mastix*, sig. I 4 v, has *sneakesbill*, for which form, and for *sneakbill*, see the new edition of Nares's *Glossary*.

Suresby. James, *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture*, &c. (1612), Part 2, p. 12. *Sym Suresby* figures in Udall's *Ralph Roister Doister* (before 1553). *Surebie* is the form in Richard Bernard, *Terence in English* (1588), p. 86 (ed. 1607). Like it, as to the absence of *s*, is *litherbie*. *Id., ibid.*, p. 19.

Here we have, annexed to adjectives and substantives, *s*, with *-by*; unless some one proves the existence of the termination *-sby*. And

"And now, sir, compliments being passed, I shall begin *upon* business." [1]

"Saying this, he snatched up his play, leaving my master to please himself with the prospect of being criticized *upon* in a newspaper." [2]

'Hah! Here 's another *visitant*, with another newspaper." [3]

At the beginning of this chapter, I quote an observation by Mr. Marsh, a philologist of high note; and many of my pages serve, incidentally, to show how far that observation is contradicted by facts. But, if a scholarly student of our language can err as Mr. Marsh has therein erred, what can be

---

what is this *-by?* Some have seen *boy* in it. The old spelling *rudesbey*, which I find once, suggests no solution.

In names of places, *-by* is Scandinavian, and denotes 'town', 'abode'. Names of places have largely become names of persons, as *Brocklesby*, *Denby*, *Derby*, *Fotherby*, *Grimsby*, *Selby*, *Thoresby*, &c. &c. *Catesby*, *Keresby*, &c., I am unable to etymologize; but we are not, with Mr. N. I. Bowditch, to find *bee*, the insect, in such names as *Allbee*, *Denbee*, and *Silsbee*. See *Suffolk Surnames*, p. 216.

Perhaps it was in unscientific imitation of proper names having *-sby* at the end, that our ancestors coined *idlesby* and its congeners.

Bumpsie has been used for 'nearly tipsy'. *Tarlton's Jests*, &c., p. 8. "A drie and *dricksie* oke." Puttenham, p. 205. Dr. John Hoadly signs himself, at the end of a letter, "Your affectionate *Fuzby*." *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 271. *Gadsi* is a Gypsy word for 'wife'. *Kypsey*, in some parts of England, means 'basket'. *Limpsy* and *linsey* go with *flimsy*. *Mopsy* long signified 'woman', 'mistress'. Stubbes, *The Anatomie of Abuses* (ed. 1836), p. 169. *Pudsey*, which seems to have preceded *pudgy*, is found in Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 7, p. 239. *Quisby* is a low term for 'indigent'. *Slingsby* I have a note of, but am not sure of its sense. *Tootsy*, in the language of the nursery, is for 'foot'. *Whimsey* is known to everybody. These words, and many like them, which might be mentioned, are etymological puzzles.

[1] Porson, *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis*, p. 21.

[2] Charles Johnson, *Chrysal*, Vol. 3, p. 215.

[3] Mrs. Cowley, *More Ways than One*, Act 3.

expected from such a person as Mr. Thackeray, when he attempts so nice a task as to write in the English current among the contemporaries of Steele, Addison, and Swift?[1] To some, perhaps to many, his well-known attempt to write thus has seemed signally successful. Of this opinion is, for instance, a eulogist in *The Saturday Review*. For we there read:[2]

"Mr. Thackeray's *Esmond* is a miracle of imitative art. . . . . It is scarcely possible for the keenest-scented critic to unearth an anachronism. . . . . Thus, no man, woman, or child, in *Esmond*, ever says anything that he or she might not have said in the reign of Queen Anne."

To expose the profound ignorance of this is sufficiently easy. Who, in Queen Anne's time, ever heard of such English as "*was being battered* down"?[3]

[1] Of the spirit, as of the language, of any bygone age, Mr. Thackeray had but a purblind perception. But, among all his works in which he has ventured into the past, that on the English humourists must, to any one who has studied those writers by the light of history, seem the most ambitiously abortive. From Mr. Thackeray, as a novelist, there are, however, lessons to be learnt which are highly valued now-a-days, and, but for supplying which, he would never be the prime favourite that he is with young Britons. And these lessons are, with others of a similar cast, to disbelieve utterly in human goodness, and to believe every one who is not of your own set to be, most likely, a "cad", and to be treated accordingly. The novels of Mr. Thackeray mirror, rigidly to the life, the conceit, superciliousness, suspicion, and jealousy of the Englishman in his latest polite phasis of degeneration. To his countrymen they have, indeed, become a very Bible, as I have more than once heard them admiringly denominated.

Mr. Thackeray's patrician slang affects, I know, many who live out of the world, just as it affects myself. Well has it been said, by Shelley: "The vulgarity of rank and fashion is as gross, in its way, as that of poverty; and its cant terms, equally expressive of base conceptions." *Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 222.

[2] Vol. 18, p. 715 (Dec. 10, 1864).

[3] Vol. 1, p. 29. Also see Vol. 2, pp. 26, 228, 244, 248. The references are to the London edition of *The History of Henry Esmond*, in three volumes, 1852.

Or of the verbs *cede*,[1] *olden*,[2] *philander*?[3] Or of *aggressive*,[4] *civilization*,[5] *transatlantic*,[6] *unpleasantry*,[7] *upset*?[8] Of *directly*,[9] *immediately*,[10] and *instantly*,[11] for 'as soon as'?[12] Of *all the same*,[13] for 'nevertheless'?

The reader will find, in the Appendix, a full discussion of phrases like that to which this note is attached.

[1] Vol. 1, p. 237.

[2] Neuter and active. Vol. 1, pp. 202, 252. I doubt that the world had often heard of this verb before 1852.

[3] Vol. 3, p. 108. This verb, not impossibly, did not see the light till after Mr. Thackeray himself. The allusion it conveys is old.

Attach, verb neuter. Vol. 1, p. 161. *Weary*, verb neuter. Vol. 1, pp. 157, 236.

These verbs are not known to the dictionary-wrights. I refer to them at pp, 283, 301, *infra*.

Narrate. Vol. 1, p. 19; Vol. 2, pp. 13, 32, 230. This verb, in Queen Anne's days, would, almost certainly, have stamped its user as Scotch. See, further, p. 121, *supra*.

[4] Vol. 3, p. 15. This adjective, at least for any noticeable currency, belongs to our century. *Vide infra*, p. 314, note 4.

[5] Vol. 3, p. 16. It appears that Mr. Thackeray could not have heard of the story connecting this word with Dr. Johnson.

[6] Vol. 3, p. 324. Who used *transatlantic* before the American Revolution? Sir William Jones used it in 1782. See *Memoirs*, &c., p. 217.

[7] Vol. 3, p. 246. Mr. De Quincey, having used the term *unpleasantries*, thus annotates on it: "This is a new and ludicrous word, launched, a very few years back, in some commercial towns. It is generally used, not in any sense that the reader would collect from its antipole, *pleasantry*", &c. *Works* (ed. 1863), Vol. 6, p. 258, foot-note.

This author is far too omniscient to be trusted implicitly; but there is scarcely room for question that *unpleasantry* sprang up during his life-time.

[8] The substantive. Vol. 1, p. 307. *Upsets*, under that name, were very rare before 1800.

[9] Vol. 3, p. 36. [10] Vol. 2, p. 279. [11] Vol. 1, p. 38.

[12] *Instantly*, as Mr. Thackeray uses it, I do not remember to have seen except in his pages. Of its synonyms, *directly* and *immediately*, the latter is the older; it having been printed in the last century, towards its close.

[13] Vol. 2, pp. 210, 292. This is a Scotticism, and was imported into England within living memory.

Of expressions like *quite a young lad*[1] and *in the interest*[2] *of justice;* or of *a young person,*[3] for 'a young woman'? Who was then so careless as to write *different to*[4] habitually? Or so curious as to have disinterred, and so eccentric as to use, the verb *advocate,*[5] the participle *humiliated,*[6] the adjective *influential,*[7] and the preposition *on to*[8]? It was all very well for Mr. Thackeray to call an inn *accustomed;* here and there to introduce phrases like *a-birding, a dish of chocolate, a pretty many, sceptic doubts, trencher-man;* to misuse *imperial,* for 'imperious'; and to call a pretty maid-servant *an ancillary beauty;* but, in these, and perhaps half a dozen more, obsoletisms,—the whole of which might be got together in two hours' reading,—is comprised everything, in his novel, at all savouring, as to language, of any days

[1] Vol. 3, p. 132. *Quite a child.* Vol. 1, p. 181. *Quite an eagerness.* Vol. 3, p. 25. Addison and his friends knew nothing of *quite,* in the sense which it has here; nor, except when the word was preceded by a negative, did they put *a* after it.

[2] Vol. 1, p. 103. We may be pretty sure that even Dr. Johnson was unacquainted with this use of *interest.*

[3] Vol. 1, p. 175. This nauseous slang Mr. Thackeray stands almost alone, among his contemporaries, in employing seriously. It is altogether modern.

[4] Vol. 1, p. 313; Vol. 2, pp. 37, 46, 78; Vol. 3, p. 165. For *different to,* see pp. 77—84, *supra.*

[5] Vol. 3, p. 59. *Vide infra,* foot of p. 285.

[6] Vol. 1, p. 141. See the foot of p. 133, *supra.*

[7] Vol. 3, pp. 242, 269. Between the days of Barrow and those of Burke, the slumbers of *influential* were disturbed very rarely. *Vide infra,* foot of p. 286.

[8] Vol. 3, p. 12. For this antique, see Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England,* p. 382.

I may add *partially,* for 'only in part', Vol. 1, p. 198. This, too, is both very old and too modern for Mr. Thackeray's purpose. For a long period it was disused. *Vide supra,* foot of pp. 191, 192.

but our own. In brief, instead of being "a miracle of imitative art," the work at which I have thus glanced lacks no one attribute of a complete failure.

As inculcating the necessity of caution, if, in dealing with language, one would avoid trespassing against the proprieties of chronology, the digression in which I have here indulged may, perhaps, be considered as pardonable.

CHAPTER VIII.

MODERNISMS EXEMPLIFIED.

Quæ est autem in hominibus tanta perversitas, ut, inventis frugibus, glande vescantur? *Cicero.*

THE complacency and the querulousness of Englishmen, traits which conflict so ludicrously in their national character, have nowhere shown themselves more conspicuously than in the opinions which we find recorded touching our language. Some of these opinions I have already adduced; and their instructiveness is such, that, except for fear of becoming wearisome, I should feel warranted in adducing many more.

From the manner in which Sir John Cheke writes about English,[1] one might almost infer, that he supposed it to have sprung from his native soil, in complete equipment for every conceivable service. At any rate, he seems to have thought that it needed, in his days, but very scant enrichment from without, for any emergent purposes whatsoever.

But the dreamy irrationality of Sir John was not at all peculiar to him. It is the great basis on which nearly everybody, from his day to our own, has philologized. Neither culture, nor erudition, nor anything but common-sense, can save a writer on language from drivelling; and philological dotage is,

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 3.

with rare exceptions, as much the rule, among our contemporaries, as it ever was. The proofs of this exist in unlimited abundance; but I shall confine myself to transcribing a passage in which, somewhat more circumstantially and concisely than is usual, absurdity attains its perfect climax.

"Some optimists may be disposed to ask, what is the good of this hair-splitting, and to say that English may safely be left to itself. But, if we examine the history of the language, we perceive, that, since the date of the authorized translation of the Bible,—the finest example of English,—the alterations that have taken place have been, generally, for the worse. The double negative has been abandoned, to the great injury of strength of expression. The inflexion of the preterite has been abandoned, with the use of the second person, that most forcible of all kinds of address. The affected Italianisms of the sixteenth century happily did not commend themselves to the translators of the Bible. They were succeeded by the more offensive Gallicisms of the modish eighteenth century, which, happily, could not maintain their hold. The nineteenth century has witnessed the introduction of abundant Gallicisms, Germanisms, Americanisms, colonialisms, and provincialisms; nearly all needless, or easily to be supplied by more correct words or phrases. There is no nation, except our own easy-going one, that would tolerate such words as *à propos* or *naïve*, the one a foreign phrase, the other the feminine of an adjective, applied indiscriminately to nouns of both genders; the Carlyleian *before-unheard-of*, *phrase-binding-together*, *Aristophanes-wise*; such vile compounds as *starvation*, a Saxon root with a Latin termination, in a misapplied sense; and the many provincial slang words, as *to run down* and *put up with*, both provincialisms: see the *Dorset Glossary*, pp. 77, 81. Now

though many provincialisms are very good English, as the Cheshire word *to clem*, for our inaccurate *to starve*, in the sense of 'dying of hunger,' yet the indiscriminate admission of slang provincialisms, in no small part due to novel-writers, is destructive of the purity of the language. Not merely in words, but even in grammatical forms, the language is still undergoing changes." [1]

How disheartening the reflection, that our language "is still undergoing changes"! When, pray, was any language not undergoing changes? And, save by effecting a total transnaturation or stagnation of the human mind, how could a language be prevented from undergoing changes? We are admonished, too, that, as to *starve*, because it meant, with our remote forefathers, more than it now means, namely, 'perish from cold, hunger, &c.', we are "inaccurate", in limiting its application; but that the antique *clem*, still surviving in Cheshire, is "very good English". In other words, whatever is old is good, and whatever is new is bad. *Starvation*, we are also told, belongs to the class of "vile compounds," from being a mongrel; as if English were not full of mongrels, and as if it would not be in distressing straits, without them. Further, *to run down* and *to put up with* are to be rejected on the ground that they are "provincialisms". [2] Even if they were so by origin,

[1] *The London Review*, Oct. 1, 1864, pp. 379, 380.

[2] But in what sense provincialisms? They may be better known to the common people of Dorsetshire than to the common people elsewhere; but that does not prove that they had their birth in Dorsetshire. Does it follow that *rive* and *sere*, because they are popularly used, in Suffolk, for *split* and *dry*, began with being Suffolkisms?

Run down, a metaphor borrowed from the chace, has every note of a *good idiom*. Nor is it modern; and it does not seem ever to have

where, it is pertinent to ask, must a word have been born, in order to be a proper word? To be reckoned lawful, must it be made out to have sprung up all over England simultaneously, like the grass in spring? And is the sanction of universal usage insufficient to legitimate it?

To the extract just commented on could be added a hundred others of a kindred purport, that is to say, conceived in a spirit of pure fatuity. That, especially in our century, people can go on writing in this way, merely demonstrates, that abiding irreflection is quite consistent with increase of general knowledge. No unprejudiced person, if he takes the trouble to observe and to consider, can soberly maintain, that English is deteriorating; and any one who remembers what new words have arisen within the last thirty years, must be convinced, from his own experience, that our language is, as it always has been, and always must be, in a state of irrepressible growth and mutation. This fact, as will be seen, is sus-

---

been vulgar. Dr. Johnson quotes South, Dryden, and Bp. Berkeley for it.

Put up with is a modification of the old *put up*,—as *do away with* is modernized from *do away*,—which was never scorned by the very best writers. *Vide supra*, p. 267.

Further, as between these two expressions and *clem*, where is the proof that the last was at any time of general currency? And, even if it had been, on what grounds would it have been better to perpetuate *clem* than *starve*? *Hunger-starve* was long our verb; but since, when *starve* denoted the effect of cold, the context indicated that denotation, *hunger* was rejected from the compound, because of its superfluousness. Finally, *starve*, as now employed, bears, we read, "a misapplied sense." The Anglo-Saxon *steorfan* had a vaguer sense than that which we now give to its descendant; but it is no valid objection to the established use of a word, that such a use was once unestablished.

I return to *starvation*, at the foot of p. 287, *infra*.

ceptible of profuse illustration; and, of the neoterisms awaiting specification in the sequel, though some of them are several generations old, there are others which have not yet attained the age of legal majority.

After the lapse of nearly a century, during which the labour bestowed in regularizing and modulating our language had operated not only to impoverish it, but to check its growth, whether from within or from without, various causes gradually concurred to restore something of its old-time fecundity. In date, this new era tallied, to all material intents, with that memorable assertion of popular rights which realized itself in the American and French Revolutions. When priestcraft was, for a considerable portion of Christendom, extinguished by the Reformation, the first great change which the languages of Europe have undergone since the period of the Crusades, immediately followed. The impulse which produced this change had, however, exhausted itself some time before the practical protest against kingcraft, and the new birth of science, both which signalized the era of the Third George, again stimulated mental activity to devise adequate expressions for new facts, and things, and thoughts. As might have been expected, the first experiments in the way of development, revival, and appropriation, of words, were, in many instances, infelicitous. But not so, by any means, were all. It is to the age of Burke, and of his fellow-liberalists who came just after him, that we are beholden for the active verbs *grow*[1] and *locate;*

[1] *Dr. Webster* writes: "Until within a few years, we never heard

for the neuter verbs *attach*,[1] *emigrate*, and *rociferate*; for *enactment*, *immigrant*, and *requisition*; for *compli-*

grow used as a transitive verb, in New England; and the ear revolts at the practice."

Dr. Webster, whatever his ear and its decisions, would have shown prudence by not talking about them.

[1] ATTACH, COMPLIMENTARY, CONFIDENTIAL, IS BEING BUILT, ACCREDIT, ADVOCATE, NOTICE, AGE, MILITATE, PROGRESS, ENTIRETY, EDUCATIONAL, INFLUENTIAL, INIMICAL, PATRIOTIC, PICTORIAL, TRUTHFUL, COMPETE, NARRATE, STARVATION, TOUT, UNWELL.

Attach.—This verb has not yet, I believe, taken its place in any Dictionary. It is used by Burke (1791), Coleridge (1799), William Taylor (1803), Charles Lamb, H. T. Colebrooke, Bishop Heber, Sir Walter Scott, Southey, Sydney Smith, Lord Macaulay, Mr. De Quincey, Dr. Newman, Mr. Ruskin, &c. &c. Generally it is followed by *to*. But I find *upon*, also, after it. See Paley, *A View of the Evidences*, &c. (1794), Vol. 1, p. 337 (ed. 1807): Bentham, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 409.

Complimentary.—Complimental was its precursor. *Vide supra*, p. 222.

Confidential.—Dr. Webster's Editors give "*trustworthy*" as one of the definitions of *confidential*. None but the uneducated use the word in such a sense.

The predecessor of *confidential* was *confident*, of course employed in an acceptation now disused.

"I had given notice to a companion of mine, a *confident* servant of my masters, that he should stay there waiting for me." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 178.

For another instance, see William Becher (1608), in *Gul. Camdeni et Illust. Vir. ad G. C. Epist.*, p. 101.

Is being built.—Add: 'to *commit* one's self'; 'to *crack* a whip'; 'to *cut* a person'; '*done up*', for 'tired out'; 'to *push* an investigation'; 'to *take shame to* one's self'; 'to *vote* one a bore'.

Accredit.—Cowper wrote, in 1793: "I am better pleased, indeed, that he censures some things, than I should have been with unmixed commendation; for his censure will — to use the new diplomatic term,—*accredit* his praises." *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 187.

As Archdeacon Todd shows, *accredit* is used by Shelton, in his translation of *Don Quixote*.

Where we use *accredit*, our forefathers long used *credit*.

"I made it my chiefe happinesse, and placed a kinde of felicitie therein, that my actions might *credit* my profession," &c. Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 198.

"I insert the word We, not to *credit* myself, but to confirm the reader." Fuller, *The Appeal*, &c. (1659), Part 3, p. 32.

mentary,[1] *confidential*,[1] and *inferential*; and for the expressions *do away with* and *is being built*.[1] The

"Thus . . . . the authority of which translation is abundantly *credited* and asserted by its being quoted in the New Testament," &c. Glanvill, *Essays*, &c. (1676), VI., p. 26.

"Such a state of things . . . . *crediteth* the Church, and graceth religion." Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 250.

Also see Milton, *Prose Works* (Bohn's ed.), Vol. 2, p. 489: Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica*, pp. 35, 87, &c.: Henry More, *Mystery of Godliness*, p. 358.

With the best writers of our age, the acceptation of *accredit* is 'invest with credit or authority', to which may be added its diplomatic sense, 'send with letters credential'. Dr. Webster's Editors give three definitions of it. The first is: "To give trust or confidence to", which is neither English nor intelligible. In the sentence which they quote in illustration, the word is badly used for 'recognize', 'acknowledge'. The second definition is: "To receive, as an envoy, in his public character, and give him credit and rank accordingly." Burke is then named; but I should be much surprised, if it were shown that his meaning has not been mistaken. In one passage, I know, Burke seems to intend, by *accredited*, simply 'possessing credit', 'authoritative', 'intrinsically influential'.

"France, in effect, has no king, nor any minister *accredited* enough, either with the court or nation, to undertake a design of great magnitude." *A Letter to the Marquis of Rockingham*, 1777.

Now-a-days, few except very bad writers employ it, after the manner of Southey, Sir Walter Scott, &c., as a robust substitute for *credit* or *believe*. Some instances follow.

"For the charge of Arianism there may, then, have been at least a plausible foundation. Is there any ground for that of Manicheism? Robinson, in *accrediting* it, fortifies himself with the authority of Limborch", &c. Southey, *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 33 (1825), p. 144.

"In the history of this remarkable man, nothing is more remarkable than his voracious credulity. He *accredited* and repeated stories of apparitions, and witchcraft, and possession, so silly, as well as monstrous, that they might have nauseated the coarsest appetite for wonder," &c. *Id.*, *Life of Wesley* (ed. 1864), Vol. 2, p. 198. Also see *Essays Moral and Political*, Vol. 1, p. 293. And I might give numerous other references to Southey.

"But Mrs. Martha Belthune Baliol, conscious that, in case of conviction, she could never have prevailed upon herself to dethrone the king of Palestine from the stone bench on which he sat for hours, knitting his stocking, refused, by *accrediting* the intelligence, even to *put him upon* his trial," &c. Sir Walter Scott, *Chronicles of the Canongate, Introductory*.

active verbs *accredit*,[1] *advocate*,[1] and *notice*;[1] the neuter verbs *age*,[1] *militate*,[1] and *progress*;[1] with *entire-*

Mr. De Quincey makes *accredit* signify 'credit', 'trust', 'esteem', &c. &c. See his *Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 47, 287; Vol. 5, p. 137; Vol. 11, p. 241; Vol. 12, pp. 90, 186. In Vol. 12, p. 165, it is used correctly.

Advocate.—"Freely to *advocate* my own astrology." Nash, *Lenten Stuffe* (1598), in *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 146.

"To *advocate* the cause of thy client". Bishop Sanderson (1624), *Sermons*, Vol. 1, p. 103 (ed. 1681).

I need not quote Milton for *advocate*, v.a. Coleridge ventured it in 1800. See *Essays on His Own Times*, p. 406. And he had been preceded by Burke. Yet Southey, in 1822, and even later, derided this verb as an Americanism. Lord Macaulay uses it.

Franklin, writing to Dr. Webster, Dec. 26, 1789, objects to the verbs active *advocate* and *notice*, to the neuter *progress*, and to the expression *opposed to*, as in, 'to be *opposed to* a measure'. *Private Correspondence* (ed. 1817), p. 126.

Advocate, as a verb neuter, is still to be recovered by our lexicographers. Here are references for it. Heylin, *Ecclesia Vindicata* (1657), Part 1, p. 77: *Examen Historicum* (1659), Part 1, pp. 175, 179, 190. Fuller, *The Appeal of Injured Innocence* (1659), Part 1, pp. 11, 47; Part 2, pp. 20, 80; Part 3, p. 81.

To the verb *advocate*, and other old words, as supposed Americanisms, I hope to recur at some future time.

Notice.—Its antiquity has been demonstrated by Malone and others. Not until after its revival, I suppose, was *noticeable* educed from it. *Noticeable* was used in 1754, by Richardson, *Sir Charles Grandison*, Vol. 2, p. 33. For *unnoticed*, see Edward Moore, *The Gamester* (1751), Act 4.

Landor, in an imaginary conversation, makes Dr. Johnson say to Horne Tooke: "I have remarked the preterite [of the verb *notice*] spelt *notic'd*, and by writers of reputation, in the beginning of this century." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 206.

Johnson, in his *Dictionary*, does not know the verb *notice*; and of its almost complete inusitation at the time he is fabled to specify, he must have been conscious.

Age.—Philemon Holland has been quoted for it. Southey adduced it from a modern book, in 1805. See *The Annual Review*, Vol. 3, p. 585.

By far the most common acceptation of the verb *age* is 'show marks of age'; and this acceptation is borne out by the quotations adduced by Dr. Webster's Editors, who, however, give the definition "to grow old, to become aged," only.

Militate.—Elsewhere I have quoted, for this word, a work printed

ty,[1] *financier, requirement, tact, totality;* and *adulatory, educational,*[1] *influential,*[1] *inimical,*[1] *patriotic,*[1] *picto-*

---

in 1675. But it was used earlier. "Certain I am, that the discourse of Clemens, in the said Epistle, doth *militate* aswell against the one as against the other." Heylin, *The History of Episcopacy* (1657), Part 2, p. 4. Also see Part 1, p. 94.

Progress.—"From Ambition and Avarice, his suborner, let me *progress* to the second son of Pride, which is Vain-glory." Nash, *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem* (1594), p. 102 (in *Archaica*, Vol. 1).

"And this is as farre as I allowed my discourse to *progresse* in this way." Donne, *Biathanatos*, p. 213 (first ed., undated).

"Wee *progresse* in the wayes of vice, and are constant in nothing but perpetuall offending." Feltham, *Resolves*, &c. (ed. 1628), Second Centurie, p. 84.

Progress, the verb neuter, long erroneously called an Americanism, has shifted its accent, in becoming modern English. That we should have a verb corresponding to the substantive *progress* is, certainly, desirable. If it had not been urgently desiderated, it would never have attained its present very general prevalence.

Entirety.—*Vide supra*, p. 43. *Educational.*—*Vide supra*, p. 131.

Influential.—Glanvill is quoted, for it, by Dr. Johnson. See, for instances, his *Essays*, &c. (1676), VI., p. 10: *Sadducismus Triumphatus* (ed. 1727), p. 10. I add other references. Gaule, Πυς-μαντία (1652), pp. 3, 49, 63, 77, 136, 137, &c.; *influentially*, p. 97. Adj. Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 143; Vol. 2, p. 168; Vol. 3, pp. 32, 254, 370: *A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*, &c. (ed. 1683), p. 140. Samuel Richardson (1754), *Correspondence*, Vol. 3, p. 216. Jones, of Nayland (bef. 1769?), *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 1, p. 145; Vol. 5, p. 1.

In the early years of this century, *influential* was denounced as an Americanism; and Englishmen accordingly felt in duty bound to shun it. In *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 28 (1817), p. 277, it is objected to in Franklin, and is called "French, rather than American". When was it ever French?

Such a reader of old English as Coleridge ought, however, to have known the word to be a revived archaism; and very likely he was quite aware of its being so. His presumable reason for substituting *influencive*, or *influensive*, we may well smile at. But *experiencive* is not the adjective which, through dislike of the ambiguity of *experimental*, he chose to fit to *experience*. Naturally enough, he gave the preference to *experiential*. For *influencive*, &c., see *The Friend* (ed. 1818), Vol. 2, p. 116: *Letters*, &c. (1836), Vol. 1, p. 157; Vol. 2, p. 224. *Uninfluencive* occurs in his *Lay Sermons*. From *Essays on His Own*

rial,[1] *truthful*,[1] were, at the same period, resuscitated, after long oblivion; and *compete*,[1] *convalesce*, *narrate*,[1] *starvation*,[1] *tout*,[1] and *unwell*[1] were cited from pro-

---

Times, pp. 91, 616, 642, we learn that he used, in 1795, *influential*, but, in 1809, *influencive* and *influensive*.

Inimical.—This word occurs in Gaule, Πῦς-μαντία, pp. 86, 180. For early uses of it in the last century, see Samuel Richardson (1758), *Correspondence*, Vol. 5, p. 189: Sterne (1762), *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 5, Ch. 35. I forbear references to Jones of Nayland, Paley, and Godwin.

Enmious is entered in the *Promptorium Parvulorum*, and is used by Fox, in his *Acts and Monuments*. Dr. Richardson quotes Evelyn for *inimicous*. Sterne uses *inimicitious*. See a letter (1760) to Warburton, in *A Selection*, &c., p. 243; and *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 4, Ch. 22 (1761).

For several rashly confident statements as to the age of *inimical*, see Dr. Worcester's *Dictionary*. Archbishop Trench really seems to attach some credit to the statement, that Burke first used this word. See *English, Past and Present* (ed. 1859), p. 71. Dr. Worcester shows that it was recognized by a Dictionary in 1678.

Patriotic.—*Vide infra*, p. 317, note 3.

Pictorial.—Dr. Johnson quotes Sir Thomas Browne for *pictorial*, on which he remarks: "A word not adopted by other writers, but elegant and useful." His definition is: "Produced by a painter." What we intend by *pictorial* critically demands—as we have *nature* and *natural—pictural*, which Spenser uses, as a substantive, for 'picture'.

Truthful.—I have been violently assailed for using this "Americanism"!

Compete.—This verb, nauseated and ridiculed, within the memory of living men, as a Scotticism, is now universally used, and without the slightest consciousness, on the part of ninety-nine persons in a hundred, that it is not as old as Shakespeare, or older. *Competitive* has sprung up during the last thirty or forty years, I believe.

Narrate.—*Vide supra*, p. 121.

Starvation.—This is an old Scotticism, as has been abundantly demonstrated. Archbishop Trench once roundly asserted: "The word is an Americanism." He wished it to be so, no doubt; and his wish was foundation enough, in such a matter, for a fact. His haste and ignorance were pointed out; and what then? "Some have supposed it to have reached us from America." *English, Past and Present* (ed. 1859), p. 78. But who were the "some"? The Archbishop self-pluralized? And is the supposition of those "some" still to be respected? Many other questions might be asked; and all because we are fobbed off with that style of evasiveness—a not unusual product of excessive

vincial or technical obscurity, to render suit and service to the great English-speaking public. Then, too, it was that *appreciate*,[2] *base, decompose, deteriorate, disorganize, magnetize;* with *demarcation, grade*,[3] and *publicist; eventual, industrial, monetary*, and *respectable*,[4] were welcomed from abroad, or devised on foreign models; and in their train came monstrosities on the type of *aristocrat, democrat*,[5] *ideology*, and *par-*

humility and unapostolic income, — which history has taught the wicked to recognize as distinctively ecclesiastical.

Tout. — *Vide supra*, foot of p. 134.

Unwell. — *Vide supra*, pp. 124, 125.

[2] Landor fictitiously represents Horne Tooke as saying to Dr. Johnson: "Only one valuable word has been received into our language since my birth, or, perhaps, since yours. I have lately heard *appreciate*, for 'estimate'." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 155.

Lord Chesterfield used *appreciate* in 1756. See *The World*, No. 196.

Appreciation seems to be older, with us, than *appreciate*. It is used by Henry More, *Annotations upon 'Lux Orientalis,'* &c. (1682-3), p. 268.

[3] *Vide supra*, p. 129.

[4] I do not know of any English authority earlier than Burke, for this word. It was French, but as a neoterism, in 1693. So says Caillière, as referred to by M. Lorédan Larchey, in *Les Excentricités du Langage* (ed. 1863), p. VI.

Unrespectable was used in 1778, by Henry Brooke, in *The Contending Brothers*.

[5] Hobbes — see my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., p. 74, — uses *democratical* as a substantive; and this, or *democratic*, accords with analogy. Compare *critic, mechanic, mimic*, &c. Burke evinced his classical instinct, when, in preference to *democrat*, he ventured *democratist*, which may be derived directly from δημοκρατίζω, 'be in favour of democracy'.

By rule, *aristocrat*, presupposing ἀριστοκρατής, — from ἀριστοκρατέω, — should mean 'ruling in the best manner', or 'ruling by means of the best', &c.; and δημοκρατής, *democrat*, should mean 'ruling by the people', 'ruling for the people', 'ruling over the people', &c. Both the Greek adjectives might be substantivized.

Δημοκρατικός, as a substantive, means exactly what the French intend by their *démocrate*, whence our *democrat*. *Democratic* and *aristocratic* ought to have been our substantives.

alyse,[1] which, with *grandiose*[2] and *stand-point*, would much better have been left at home. Such are a few of the numerous innovations which we owe to our more recent predecessors. The licences of language which they allowed themselves are similar, in kind, to those that mark the history of English in all its bygone stages; but their quantity is incomparably greater than that which was generated during the interval spanned by the death of Milton and the supremacy of Johnson. Our grandfathers, insensible to what extent, in subjection to the bias of the age, they practically disregarded purism, deferred, theoretically, to the teachings of their sires, and industriously inculcated it. More alive than they to the peculiar demands of the intellectual activity which distinguishes our century, our fathers, a few adherents to the ancestral cult excepted, rather left the old idol to the moles and the bats, and, with or without set purpose and design, brought forth fruits which would not have shamed the most deliberate verbiculture. Nor is the present generation any more disposed than the last was, to profess fealty to a fusty and fantastic superstition. As in the order of nature generally, so in language,

---

No less bad than *democrat* are William Taylor's and Coleridge's *physiocrat*, and Southey's *pantisocrat*, instead of which Lord Macaulay has *pantisocratist*.

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 174, note 4.

[2] This word is so much needed, that its being a malformation is the more to be deplored. We took it from the French, before whom, however, the Italians had educed *grandioso* from *grandis*, against all law. Yet we ourselves, long ago, did just as ill, in shaping *illustrious* out of *illustris* or *illustre*. And just like *illustrious* is our forefathers' *enormious*,—from *enormis* or *enorme*,—which we are not to account singularly *monstruous*, as the same forefathers wrote, very allowably.

there obtains the law of incessant decay and incessant compensatory renewal. Some words, do what we may to retain them, will fall out of sight; and other words, do what we may to intercept or resist them, will emerge, and win their way to acceptance. The former fade and vanish away, because they have served out their turn; the latter spring up obediently to influences of which it is impossible to forecast the products. The vicissitudes of language are, thus, a thing over which our volitions rarely have a calculable control. Truisms as they are, these facts, if duly weighed, should suffice to dissuade from that unfavourable opinion of modern English, on which so many pique themselves, as being a proof of their sagacity, or more refined taste. Moreover, freely as we of the nineteenth century neoterize, it must be indubitable to any observant student of English, past and present, that, relatively to their amount, new words, and new meanings of old words, have been scrutinized much more jealously, during the last seventy years, than they ever were scrutinized before. In presence of this truth, it strikes one with surprise to come upon the assertion, from a scholar like Landor,[1] that "our language, for the last half-century, has fallen more rapidly into corruption and decomposition than any other ever spoken among men."[2]

[1] *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 164.

[2] Would that pessimists could learn to stifle their flatulent lamentations. Listen to another, one who, for all his unctuous clutter, is, certainly, the most mechanical of contemporary prelates. "Surely, in a degree which, perhaps, was never before equalled in the history of mankind, worldliness, in its most intense activity, is around us, and so must threaten our souls." Bishop Wilberforce, *Sermons, &c.*, Second *Series (1863)*, p. 268.

To follow the ruling fashion of the present time, I am aware that I ought to depreciate modern English, and, if not sit in the seat of the scornful, at least assume sackcloth and ashes, for its multiplied transgressions. There are those, however, who, like the writer of these pages, with as little fear of being counted unfashionable as care to be counted fashionable, distinctly avow an exceedingly good opinion of the language, taken for all in all, of the days on which we have fallen.[1] Though our contemporaries produce much of bad and inferior writing, they produce much more which, in various degrees, up to the highest, is excellent. And so deems the most proficient stylist that our literature, taken in its fullest compass, can hitherto boast. "This", says Dr. Newman,[2] "is not a day for great writers, but for

Let us give ear, for a moment, to another croaker.

"The prevailing opinions of this age go to the destruction of everything which has hitherto been held sacred. They tend to arm the poor against the rich; the many against the few: worse than this,—for it will also be a war of hope and enterprise against timidity,—of youth against age. . . . . The fact is undeniable, that the worst principles in religion, in morals, and in politics, are, at this time, more prevalent than they ever were known to be in any former age." Southey, *Colloquies*, &c. (ed. 1831), Vol. 1, pp. 31, 32.

This was written in 1829; and, since gentlemen of the old school maintain that the world goes on steadily from bad to worse, how intensely rotten the present generation must be,—the children of the corruption thus wailfully depicted!

[1] Part of my thesis resembles that of Godwin, who, in 1797, wrote his *Essay on English Style*, "to shew that the English language was never in so high a state of purity and perfection as in the present reign of King George the Third." *The Enquirer*, pp. 369, 370.

Further on, Godwin asserts, and with perfect truth, "that the ordinary standard of elegant composition, at the present day, is superior to the standard of English composition at any preceding period." *Ibid.*, p. 472.

[2] While never shrinking from a useful neoterism, whether borrowed

good writing, and a great deal of it. There never was a time when men wrote so much, and so well,

---

or extemporized, Dr. Newman, when writing at his best, comes nothing short of Addison, for grace, and, for correctness, is incomparably his superior. It is no secret, that he composes with great rapidity; and occasionally we meet, in him, with a sentence which a moment's labour would have enabled him to amend materially. Nor, considering his taste, his matchless command of expression, and his perfect clearness as to his meaning, is there any ground for apprehension, that, if he used the file, he would use it otherwise than as a master. Briefly, his eloquence is that of nature, improved by the highest culture, and insensibly controlled by the most liberal and rational principles as to the true purpose of language. His antipodes are not far to seek; and the general reader will not require to be reminded of that nebulous and painful anabaptist, the Rev. John Foster, or of Archbishop Trench, and his agonizing contortions, or of Mr. De Quincey, with his perpetual challenge to pause and wonder at his superfine affectations.

Having studied nearly every line of Dr. Newman's voluminous writings, I am surprised to find how little there is in them, as regards words and uses of words, to arrest unfavourable attention. *Directly*, in the sense of 'as soon as', one may have a personal dislike of; but, after all, it may simply anticipate on the English of the future. *Assist*, for 'be present', still has a foreign air about it. *Realize*, meaning 'think of as real', smacks of the slang of pietists. *Ere*, for 'before', belongs to the diction of poetry. *Notwithstanding*, for 'nevertheless', is careless; and so is *has drank*. 'Neither A nor B *are*' is archaic. *On the long run* is eccentric. *Dement*, *harass*, and *make-belief* are strange substitutes for *demented*, *harassment*, and *make-believe*. *Indulgence* we hardly need, as a verb active; and as little do we need the verb neuter *passage*. Elsewhere I have taken exception to one or two peculiarities of Dr. Newman's phraseology, not here specified.

Let us now turn to another writer of high and deserved repute, the last of our really well-informed lingual conservatives. Like Dr. Newman, Lord Macaulay uses *assist* for 'be present'. His *dead-born* for 'still-born', *whittle* for 'knife', and *observation of the Sabbath* for 'observance of the Sunday', whatever they once were, are not now English, but Scotch. His *flesher* for 'butcher', and *twaddle* for 'twaddler', have always belonged, I believe, to the north of the Tweed. His use of *parts* for 'talents', and his verb active *pleasure*, with 'neither A nor B *are*', and his *democratical*, *prosaical*, and several similar forms, are archaisms which have an appearance of quaintness in modern writing. His *embowel*, for 'disembowel', is scarcely more tolerable than *disannul*. As little deserving of imitation is his loose employment of *in-*

and that without being of any great account, themselves. While our literature, in this day, especially the periodical, is rich and various, its language is elaborated to a perfection far beyond that of our classics, by the jealous rivalry, the incessant practice, the mutual influence, of its many writers. In point of mere style, I suppose an article in the *Times* newspaper, or *Edinburgh Review*, is superior to a preface of Dryden's, or a *Spectator*, or a pamphlet of Swift's, or one of South's sermons."[1]

To specify all our words of recent introduction or resuscitation would take me far beyond what I now attempt. To give samples of them is quite as much as I can undertake, particularly since I go back, for modernisms, as far as 1760,[2] the first year of the Third George. Nor is the limit here fixed wholly arbitrary; for any one who has studied our language, with reference to its changes since the death of Milton, must acknowledge that my limit answers, roughly, to a fact of history. It was not far from 1760, that the rage for impoverishing and emasculating English received a check, and the feeling began to revive, that novelty was not necessarily synonymous with barbarism, and might consist even with

finitely, a word which, in rigid propriety, should be restricted to matters of physical science, theology, and pure nonsense. Lord Macaulay's *bemean*, and his application of the term "*missile* weapon" to a musket, I have already animadverted on. For the first, see my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., p. 105, note 2; for the other, *supra*, foot of p. 171.

[1] *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects* (1859), pp. 112, 113.

[2] Some few of the words enumerated in the following pages had been proposed, and even sparingly used, before that date,—and even long before it;—but, to the best of my recollection, none of them, till a later period, attained anything like popularity.

elegance. More explicitly, from about that time we are to date the influence, on our language, of Johnson and of Burke,—of both, as reformers, and of the latter, at an after-period, as an intrepid innovator. To the lessons, all the more salutary for their difference of tenor, which they practically taught, we are to attribute, in no small measure, the extinction of the old literary creed, that to imitate the easy flow of Addison, or of Middleton, should be a writer's highest ambition.

Ages have elapsed since the specific type of our language, as we now possess it, was fixed definitively; and the accessions to our vocabulary, of which account is here taken, in no respect differ, as to general character, from the verbal stores accumulated by our predecessors during several preceding centuries. The development presented in the modern locution *is being built* is fully matched by the invention of *its*[1] in the days of Queen Elizabeth; but, these extreme and disparate instances of innovation apart, we of later times have neoterized precisely in the same direction with all our ancestors since the Reformation. The neoterisms about to be adduced, taken with those noted in other parts of this treatise, will, probably, be esteemed sufficient, on comparison with our older words, to establish the soundness of this position. Nor less will they demonstrate, that, when circumstances call for them, new expressions are certain to be devised, and, in proportion to their utility, are certain to be adopted.

Among our neoteric verbs, those in *-ize* are exceed-

[1] See a note on this word, in the Appendix.

ingly numerous. *Demoralize*, by whomever introduced into English, was soon found to be indispensable.[1] *Emphasize* certainly has nothing of the

[1] Dr. Webster, we are told, claimed to have first employed *demoralize*. It is "bad enough in structure," says the Rev. Mr. Blackley, in his *Word Gossip*, p. 188. This impracticable rigour of criticism applies to many other verbs which careful and learned writers have deemed allowable, and reminds one of the ostracizing rage of Horne Tooke; for, in the list of several hundred most useful words which he would have turned out of our language, are *acoustics, fragile, horticulture, putative, synoptical, trend, venial.* Among recent coinages similar to *demoralize* are *debarbarize, debrutalize, decentralize, dechristianize, decivilize, deconservatize, dematerialize, demonarchize, denationalize, denaturalize, depaganize, dephysicalize, depoliticalize, dereligionize, devitalize.*

These words may be connived at; but that eminent scientist, Professor Huxley, puts philological patience to a severe test, where he writes that "this immense fauna of Miocene Arctogæa . . . . . is shrunk and *depauperized* in North Asia," &c. *Critiques and Addresses* (1873), p. 206. *Depauperize* ought, regularly, to mean something like the reverse of *pauperize*. The analogy of *deminuere* we have not, hitherto, availed ourselves of.

In many places, the learned Professor, following a bad lead, also uses the verb *ankylose*,—as he spells, somewhat improving on the *anchylose* of sundry other biologists. *Ancylose* I forgot, when speaking of its better-known kindred, *anastomose* and *diagnose*. To those who are able to accept it, I would certainly offer *ancylosize*.

A third word used by the Professor seems to be one of those which have been coined by himself. I mean *homotaxis*, which, he tells us, at p. 183, "has not, so far as I know, found much favour in the eyes of geologists." Perhaps these gentlemen are beginning to study Greek. *Homotaxis* is impossible: *homotagia*, or—which is better for us, and defensible,—*homotaxia, homotaxy*, is the eligible form; and the adjective already assigned to *homotaxis, homotaxial*, fits it no less well than *homotactic*.

Nor, because he may write *epigenesis*, is he authorized in writing *abiogenesis, biogenesis, heterogenesis, homogenesis, xenogenesis*, instead of *abiogenesia*, &c. Such coinages are scientistic, rather than scientific.

If, at p. 38, *supra*, I did not stop to condemn *hæmatemesis*, it was because modern medical writers, as corruptionists, seem to be incorrigible, and because it matters very little, in general, whether their technicalities are normal or abnormal. *Hæmatemesia* and *hæmemesia* represent Greekish inventions which obey analogy. The Tagliacotian operation is not to be extended from surgery to philology; and profane

air of a novelty; and yet it is as modern as it is useful. *Liberalize* cannot, I suspect, be traced further back than to the time of Burke.[1] The modern deflection of the sense of *realize*,[2]—a deflection which

---

doctors may well take a leaf from the book of their sacred brethren, who never fail of ruthless grammatical exactness, in fitting a new heresy with its appropriate designation.

[1] The substantives *liberal* and *liberalism* are much more recent.

"The celebrated Marquis of Lansdowne introduced a useful word, which has, of late, been warmly adopted in France, as well as in England,—to *liberalize*." Isaac D'Israeli, *Curiosities of Literature*, History of New Words.

[2] "Yet, even these are much concerned to *realize* the brevity and uncertainty of their present state, that they may be stimulated to make the most and the best of it." Rev. John Newton (1775), *Cardiphonia*, Letters to a Nobleman, No. 18.

Dr. Newman, *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles*, pp. 73, 75, 125. Bishop Wilberforce, *Addresses*, &c. (ed. 1860), p. 153. Mr. J. S. Mill, *On Liberty* (people's edition, 1865), p. 25. With these references, others, to the Rev. Henry Martyn, Lord Teignmouth, Dr. Pusey, Mr. E. A. Freeman, &c. &c., might be given.

On considering the subjoined passages, one will see how easily *realize* came by its latest sense.

"His fancy only placed Cæsar so continually in his eye, that it *realized* him to his imagination; and he believed he saw him." De Foe, *The Political History of the Devil* (ed. 1840), p. 262.

"All joy or sorrow for the happiness or calamities of others is produced by an act of the imagination, that *realizes* the event, however fictitious, or approximates it, however remote, by placing us, for a time, in the condition of him whose fortune we contemplate." Dr. Johnson, *The Rambler*, No. 60.

"To put these materials to poetical use, is required an imagination capable of painting nature, and *realizing* fiction." *Id.*, *Life of Milton*.

"Particularly in the case of reputation, no man can, without pain, *realize*, as to himself, the facility with which partialities are discarded, friendships dissolved, and the man who was your warmest advocate subsides into indifference or worse." Godwin, *The Enquirer*, p. 293.

Dr. Johnson's second definition of *realize*, but unsupported by a quotation, is "convert into land." In the sense of 'gain', this verb is "used in America", Dr. Worcester says. And so, for more than half a century, it has been used in England.

may, in part, be compared with that of the sense of *ascertain*,—though not altogether in the best taste, claims recognition in this place. *Utilize*, early, if not originally, was ventured by the very epic Joel Barlow, in his *Columbiad*. But the English-speaking world was not yet ready, in the days of the divine Joel, for a word which is now of universal currency.[1] And I might remark on *acclimatize, actualize, antagonize, antithesize, appetize,*[2] *botanize, centralize, coalize, conventionalize, deodorize, differentialize, dissocialize, economize,*[3] *eulogize, euphemize, Europeanize, excursionize,*[4] *feudalize, fluidize, focalize, fossilize, fraternize, generalize, geologize, lionize, localize, maximize,*[5] *mediatize, memorialize,*[6] *metaphysicize, minimize, mobilize, mosaicize, mysticize, nationalize, neologize, oxidize, pedestrianize, popularize, pragmatize, prodigalize,*

"And is the money arrived at Mr. Webb's? Send me an account of the number of crowns you *realize*." Shelley (1819), *Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 237.

Southey used the expression "*realize* a maintenance", in the last century. See *Letters*, &c. (Bristol, 1797), p. 25.

[1] Like *demoralize*, it was taken from the French; and, doubtless, if we had had, like them, an adjective *utile*, in addition to our *utility*, *utilize* would have been less slow than it was in obtaining naturalization. See, further, p. 128, *supra*, text and note 9.

[2] *Vide supra*, foot of p. 132.

[3] Archdeacon Todd wrote, in 1818: "Both in French and English, [this word is] of very recent usage." *Économiser* was then at least a century old.

[4] *Excursionize* was very soon suggested by *excursionist*. *Excurse*, as a verb neuter, is used by Richardson, in *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 3, p. 71; as a verb active, by Hallam. Charles Lamb has the verb neuter *excursion*. See his *Letters* (ed. 1837), Vol. 2, p. 181.

[5] In *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 18 (1818), p. 129, exception is taken to the following words, used by Bentham: *annuality, trienniality, beneficialness, undangerousness, knowable, maximization, minimization.*

[6] *Vide supra*, foot of p. 171.

puritanize, rationalize, reorganize, revolutionize, ritualize, sectarianize, sentimentalize, soberize,[1] *soliloquize, subsidize, systematize, terrorize, theorize, totalize, tranquillize, victimize.*[2]

Demarcate[3] is, undeniably, a useful word; for it is idle to say that we have any synonym of it. *Criminate* was well worth reviving; and *isolate*[4] we could ill part with. *Itinerate*[5] is now freely employed, where *journey* would be inadequate. *Originate,* in its active sense,[6] was, while novel, violently attacked, simply because of its novelty. Modern verbs, similar, as regards termination, to the foregoing, are seen in

---

[1] Lord Lytton, *The Caxtons* (1-vol. ed., 1856), p. 262. But Richardson used the word long ago. See *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 4, p. 245.

[2] For more such verbs, *vide supra*, foot of p. 174, and foot of p. 194.

[3] The Editors of Dr. Webster's *Dictionary* pronounce *demarcate* to be "rare". What can be their acquaintance with modern literature? *Demark*, though it is not very uncommon, they do not insert at all. As to *demarcation*, following Dr. Webster, they take the liberty of sophisticating Burke, in making him write *demarkation*.

[4] "The affected, Frenchified, and unnecessary word *isolated* is not English, and, we trust, never will be." So *The British Critic*, Oct., 1800, as quoted by Archdeacon Todd, who adds: "I fully agree with the writer, in considering it as a most affected word." The Archdeacon does not, indeed, formally assent to the verdict, that it is "unnecessary"; but his assent may be assumed. Everything new, just because of its newness, seems to have been, in his opinion, superfluous.

[5] Cockeram gives this word; but it hardly had a recognizable existence, until it was taken up by Wesley and his followers. Southey, Mr. De Quincey, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, and Mr. W. E. Gladstone have lent it their countenance.

[6] There is no reason why, like *end*, *origin* should not develop an active verb, as well as a neuter; and the termination of *originate* is as appropriate to one sort of verb as to another.

Landor makes Dr. Johnson say: "Scholars will always say 'The measure originated *from* him'." *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 165. Nevertheless, scholars already have, in such a case, often said *with*. And how was the Doctor to see so clearly into the future?

adulate, affiliate, annotate, centesimate, certificate, circumambulate, differentiate, domesticate, equate, etiolate, exfodiate, formulate, gyrate, intensate, jubilate, manipulate, methylate, migrate, orientate, perorate, potentiate, rehabilitate,[1] *rubricate, spoliate, triangulate.*[2]

Bank, that is to say, 'have certain dealings with a banking establishment', though very recent, apparently, is one of those instinctive coinages which take their place in a language, without provoking demur, or even attracting attention as novelties. *Classify* could not look more natural than it does, if it had lived through a millennium; and what should we do without *edit, fidget, identify, philander, photograph, pirouette*, and *pooh-pooh?* *Condone*, an old legal technicality, has, of late, received a popular welcome, as a stately euphemism for 'pardon' or 'overlook'. *Revolt*, in the sense of 'provoke aversion in', 'shock',[3] is, I believe, scarce a century old; it being a neoterism with Bishop Warburton, Horace Wal-

[1] This old law-term has been gaining ground ever since it was introduced into popular discourse by Burke, to whom it may have been suggested by the French *réhabiliter*. Equally with its substantive, *rehabilitation*, it enables us to dispense with a tedious circumlocution.

Mr. E. A. Freeman calls *rehabilitate* a "cant word." *Historical Essays*, Vol. 1 (ed. 1871), p. 329.

In the seventeenth century, our ancestors used *reestate*. *Dishabilitate*, in 1827, Archdeacon Todd described as "a word now in common use." Who would now believe it?

[2] Southey once uses the old verb *difficultate*, a malformation.

[3] Archdeacon Todd has "turn", which, as a definition, is vague and inexact. His misdefinition shows how unfamiliar *revolt*, in its modern sense, must have been to him. Yet even his quotations from Warburton and Burke should have taught him its later meaning.

"What there is of a religious cast in the volume, I have thrown towards the end of it, for two reasons; first, that I might not *revolt* the reader at his entrance, and, secondly, that my best impressions might be made last." Cowper (1784), *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 87.

pole, William Godwin, and Southey. *Sanction*, it will surprise most of my readers to be told, is not so ancient as our republic. *Shunt*, a very old word, but which, prior to the era of railways, was only an obscure provincialism, is now known and used by everybody, at least in England; and even metaphorical applications of it are by no means infrequent. *Supplement* has firmly established itself, in spite of the hostile criticism which it has evoked.[1] *Test* appears to have slumbered a long while after the days of Shakespeare. Our countrymen falsely have the credit of reviving it;[2] and it is now accepted English again. Even such a purist as Lord Macaulay uses it more than once; and it is found in the pages of Dr. Arnold, Abp. Whately, Mr. De Quincey, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, and Mr. E. A. Freeman. *Worsen*, both as a verb active and as a verb neuter, was revived by

[1] Very thoughtlessly, it has been called anomalous. Exact parallels to it are seen in scores of verbs, as *fence*, *floor*, *ornament*, *roof*, &c. &c. For more such, *vide supra*, p. 75, note 1; and p. 169, note 2.

According to Mr. W. E. Gladstone, it had its birth in Scotland. *Financial Statement*, &c. (1863), p. 442. It was not long in developing *supplementation*, which is used by the Rev. Charles Kingsley, and also by several writers of better repute.

Equally handy with the verb *supplement* is the verb *interview*, which is really needed, and has, already, been largely adopted. 'To *cable* a message' is just as convenient, and deserves to become permanent.

[2] "She cannot break through a well-*tested* modesty." Richardson, *Clarissa Harlowe*, Vol. 3, p. 187.

"You have been sufficiently *tested*." Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (1760), Vol. 1, p. 138 (ed. 1792).

"She shall be *tested*." *Id.*, *Antony and Cleopatra* (1778), Act 4, Scene 3.

"But I will *test* (as an American would say; though, let it be observed, in passing, that I do not *advocate* the use of Americanisms), —I will *test* Mr. Campbell's assertion." Southey, *The Doctor* (1-vol. ed.), p. 397

Southey and William Taylor, whose example in using it has been followed by Mr. De Quincey, Mr. W. E. Gladstone,[1] and many others. After being good Old English, it long had no vogue but provincial. It is not surprising that those who write much should, if they know the word, now and then feel *deteriorate* to be weak in comparison. Among our modern miscellaneous verbs are, also, *clerify, codify, countrify, densify, intensify, jellify, simplify, torpify; coarsen, hoarsen, smarten; allowance, bracket, burke, caricature, chloroform, complement, conscribe, cuddle, deplete, deploy,*[2] *disbar, disestablish,*[3] *disrate, drape, electioneer, engineer,*[4] *enlist, evanesce, exchequer, excrete, exhume, facsimile, flick, genuflect, ignore,*[5] *improvise, levant, loot, malinger, nag, paraph, patent, potter, quay, rat, recoup, scamp, schedule, scrunch, silt, stockade, stoke, telegraph, tidy, tour,*[6] *tub, weary.*[7]

[1] See *Juventus Mundi* (1869), p, 185.

[2] "A military word of modern times, hardly wanted in our language; for it is, literally, to 'display'." Archdeacon Todd. This criticism is characteristically Toddian.

[3] This verb, according to Dr. Webster's Editors, is "obsolete"; but such it never has quite been, since first it was coined; and now it is in all English mouths. *Disestablishment*, likewise now very current, was employed, by William Taylor, in 1806: see *The Annual Review*, Vol. 4, p. 264. It is not yet in any dictionary accessible to me. *Disendow* is similarly unrecognized. The revived *disestablish*, and its conjugates, with *infallibilist*, are striking instances of words suddenly familiarized by popular interest.

[4] Cowper wrote, as long ago as 1781: "Unless we *engineered* him with question after question, we could get nothing out of him." *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 64.

[5] *Vide supra*, p. 118, note 1.

[6] In enumerating our neoterisms, it should be remembered that we are to add, to our new verbs, the substantives and words of other parts of speech that have grown out of them.

[7] I mean the verb neuter. Rather than English, it long was Scotch, but is now common, at least in conversation. It is in no dictionary

A few of our new substantives shall next be mentioned.

Analogue, like *homologue*,[1] we have to thank the French for; and so convenient an expression we, once possessing it, could hardly do without. *Antecedents*,[2] for which, also, we are indebted to France,

---

that I know of. Miss Carter used it more than a century ago, in 1769. "The spirit *wearies* with perpetual dissipation." *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 379. Also see, for it, Dr. Newman, *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects* (1859), p. 360.

[1] Certain idly nice scholars have preferred *analogon* and *homologon*. If *synagogue* had, in their time, been struggling for recognition, no doubt they would have voted for *synagoge*. Those who favour *akmé* might as well favour *charaktér*.

[2] Landor writes of "what the French have lately taught us to call his *antecedents*." Sagaciously, he has no objection to offer. *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 176. Dr. Newman uses it in his *Discussions and Arguments*, &c., pp. 343, 385.

Mr. De Quincey calls *antecedents*, as now used, "modern slang". *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 449.

"The use of this word as in the question, 'What do you know of that man's *antecedents?*' is not defensible, except upon the bare plea of mutual agreement. For, in meaning, it is awkward perversion; and, in convenience, it has no advantage. . . . : . But to call the course of a man's life until the present moment his *antecedents*, is nearly as absurd a misuse of language as can be compassed. And it is a needless absurdity. For, if, instead of 'What do you know of his *antecedents?*' it is asked, 'What do you know of his *previous life?*' or, better, 'What do you know of his *past?*' there is sense, instead of nonsense, and the purpose of the question is fully conveyed." Mr. R. G. White, *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 91, 92.

What better plea, one would like to know, can there be for a word, or for the use of a word, than "mutual agreement", or, in English, 'common agreement'? Mr. White admits—which I cannot admit—that a military general's official predecessors may correctly be styled his *antecedents;* and he grants the rationality of *antecedents* grammatical, logical, and mathematical. In every one of these cases, this Latinistic term for 'foregoers' has its broad etymological sense specialized. It is simply a new specialization of this sense that Mr. White resists, and calls "awkward perversion", "needless absurdity", "nonsense", and what not. He does not see, that his only real argument consists in his general aversion to things which did not enjoy the ap-

is not yet a generation old. It well deserved the popularity which it very speedily attained. *Bestowal* and *bestowment* are words at which Dr. Johnson

---

probation of his grandfathers and grandmothers, in whose days an "absurdity" may have been better than "needless", perhaps.

M. Wey is wroth with M. Cousin, for saying that Aristotle was Kant's *antécédent*, and remarks: "Ce substantif ne peut désigner une personne, et devenir synonyme de *prédécesseur*, de *précurseur*, etc." *Remarques sur la Langue Française*, Vol. 2, p. 126.

We once had, for all the silence of the lexicographers, *antecedent* as a personal agential.

"Hee 's every thing, indeed, ...

. . . . . .

My *antecedent*, or my gentleman usher."

Massinger, *The City-madam*, Act 2, Scene 2.

To return to Mr. White. Almost as often as this critic ventures an appeal to reason, his readers may be certain that something raw is imminent. In the new edition of *Words and Their Uses*, he takes exception to Lord Macaulay for writing: "Skinner, it is well known, held the *same* political opinions *with* his illustrious friend". On this and other passages the comment is: "Does the eminence of the writers make such a use of language authoritative? Certainly not. Here reason comes in, and sets aside the weight of authority, however eminent. . . . . *Same* expresses identity, and, therefore, cannot properly be used in correspondence to *with*, which means nearness, contact, and implies duality, severalness."

Now, the very mention of "identity" should have suggested *identical*, which, a synonym of *same*, takes *with*,—the preposition after *one*, also, another synonym of *same*. And 'equal *with*' was once as good as 'equal *to*'. The propriety of Mr. White's "therefore", in what he says about *same*, is one of the profound mysteries with which his book abounds. Sometimes, 'the *same as*' is preferable to 'the *same with*'; but it is where a conjunction is indispensable; and it is not because of any particular relational import belonging to *as*. Phrases, in many cases, must be accepted as wholes. Lord Macaulay disliked ellipses; and *as*, instead of his *with*, would necessitate one. So we no longer say, except in church: "Because there is none other that fighteth for us, *but* only *thou*, O God." Further, if we may not say *same with*, how, in propriety, can we say *sameness with?* Mr. White is, to be sure, benevolently disposed towards Lord Macaulay, and would not excommunicate him for his "occasional lapses", of which he has exhibited what he accounts a specimen. His benevolence, in this instance, may unhesitatingly be resumed for future expenditure.

would have stood aghast, unless he had himself invented them, or unless they could be pointed out in some old author, which is unlikely. Both are analogical; but no person with an ear will hesitate, for a moment, to prefer the first.[1] *Betrayal*, a more euphonious form than *betrayment*, and quite as normal, has completely superseded it. Byron, Southey, Dean Milman, and Archbishop Whately, with others, have so accustomed us to this word, that it is difficult to believe it the novelty it really is. *Celebrity*, *mediocrity*, and *notoriety* have followed *notability*, in becoming personal substantives. *Custodian*, as legitimate a derivative as *historian*, or *librarian*, suggests, much more immediately and exactly than *keeper*, *guardian*, or *superintendent*, 'one who has custody'. *Decade*, which began with denoting any 'aggregate of ten', has now come to mean 'decennium' or 'space of ten years';[2] and learned writers so employ it.[3] This new sense of the word has not yet attracted the attention of our dictionary-makers; nor has the new sense of *centenary*, which, though it does not embody *annus*, now signifies 'centennial celebration'.[4] Com-

[1] "*Bestowment* is preferable to *bestowal*, on account of the concurrence of the two vowels in *bestowal*." Dr. Webster. What a reason!

[2] In the time of the great French Revolution, the period of ten days which was to take the place of the old week, was styled *décade*.

[3] Among them are Mr. De Quincey, Mr. J. S. Mill, Dr. Newman, and Professor Huxley.

[4] *Centenary* is used by Hakewill,—who has "*centenary* of years", also, as has Howell, in his *Dodona's Grove*, p. 76,—just as we have come to use *century*. *An Apologie*, &c. (ed. 1630), pp. 49, 50, &c. This use of *centenary* also occurs earlier, namely, in *A World of Wonders* (1607), pp. 229, 327, 331.

And here I may fitly note *centenarian*, with *septuagenarian*, *octogenarian*, and *nonagenarian*, words unknown to Dr. Johnson. Neither

pare *century*, originally 'aggregate of a hundred' in general. *Diplomatist*[1] made its first appearance, I suspect, only fifty or sixty years ago. *Enlightenment* is, to this day, always used, by a certain class of English writers, with a manifest sneer. The writers referred to are those who would rather have been born under the rule of barons than under the inchoate rule of reason, and would gladly exchange the age of science for the ages of faith and folly. Those who object to the word will ordinarily be found to object to all that it stands for. *Executive* is alleged to have originated in our country;[2] but scarcely an Englishman, especially if unaware of this allegation, now scruples to make use of it. *Inaptitude* and *ineptitude* have been usefully despecifi-

---

he nor Archdeacon Todd gives even *sexagenarian*, which occurs, according to Dr. Worcester, in Bentley. Southey has *centenary*, for the substantive *centenarian*. See *The Doctor* (one-vol. ed.), p. 333.

[1] There are those, even now, who will have *diplomate*; and I have heard Englishmen pronounce as if *aristocrate*, *démocrate*, and *franchise* had not been Anglicized.

[2] I think I have seen it somewhere in Burke. At all events, it is used by Charles Johnson. See *Chrysal* (ed. 1777), Vol. 4, p. 187. Coleridge used it in 1799 and in 1811. See *Essays on His Own Times*, pp. 337, 827.

Comparable with *executive* is *serial*, to designate a literary production issued in parts. *Special*, another adjectival substantive, once used to denote a particular thing, is now sometimes used to denote a particular person. Analogous is *vernacular*,—supplying the place of the old *vulgar*, for 'vulgar tongue', used by Sir Thomas Elyot and Puttenham, and even by Southey,—which, having long been restricted, in more popular usage, to qualify 'language', has now become also a substantive, absorbing its ordinary adjunct. To the class of words here adverted to belong *annual*, *biennial*, *casual*, *cereal*, *component*, *convalescent*, *expert*, *locomotive*, *open*, *perennial*, *professional*, *suburban*, and many other terms of prime convenience. See further, my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., pp. 73—75; and *supra*, p. 169, note 2.

cated;[1] and only the latter now imports 'folly'. The former must be regarded as a domestic coinage, based on *aptitude*. *Insularity* is a word for which, as succinctly defining their geographical peculiarity, our transmarine kinsmen ought to feel thankful, and for which, as pungently intimating their most conspicuous ethical peculiarity, we cismarines do feel thankful.[2] *Jungle*, derived to us, through the living languages of India, from the Sanskrit, may now be regarded as good English. The sort of wild which it denotes is common enough in many countries, but is not nearly so aptly designated by any other expression. *Locution*, though long ago first used in English, has only of late years become at all common. The French has, doubtless, to account for its present existence in our language.[3] *Material* was rarely

[1] It is their despecification—not the words themselves,—that belongs to our period. *Inept* was not needed to mean the same as *unapt;* but its derivative, *ineptitude*, was acceptable as a sonorous synonym of 'folly'. *Inaptitude*, for 'want of aptitude', is used by Shenstone, Goldsmith, Burke, Cumberland, Godwin, Wraxall, Southey, Wordsworth, Shelley, Hazlitt, Mr. De Quincey, and Mr. Matthew Arnold, among modern writers.

Sir Joshua Reynolds, in the original edition of his *Discourses*, uses *inaptitude*, for which the edition of his *Literary Works*, published in 1819, gives, in Vol. 2, p. 167, *ineptitude*. His *cotemporary*, also, is there always changed into *contemporary*, and, on one occasion, his substantive *antiquarian* into *antiquary*.

[2] I have seen the word noted as the malicious device of some American. But why malicious? Some things are perceived only at a distance.

Coleridge used *insularity* in 1800. See *Essays on His Own Times*, p. 309.

[3] Lord Macaulay again and again uses *phrase*, for 'single word', as well as for 'combination of words'. To him, therefore, *locution*, which imports either, would have been superfluous. In the comprehensive sense of 'mode of expression', it is daily becoming more and more familiar.

used till within the last hundred years. In the case of anything made up of a single substance, to speak of its *materials* was likely to mislead. It was this consideration, assisted by the French *matériel*, that gave us *material*.[1] *Monograph*[2] is one of those numerous neoterisms which stand amply justified by their superior distinctness of definition. An adherent to old fashions would prefer the vague *essay*.

A few other revivals shall here be glanced at.

Appliance, a word which our grandfathers would have regarded as very quaint, certainly owes its reappearance to the increased study, during later years, of old English literature. Few of the archaisms which have recently been endowed with new life are more felicitous.

Belongings, as an old expression now reinstated in its former rights, is peculiar to the very latest period of our language. The more of such vernacularisms we call up from the past, the better.

Complex, the substantive, is now beginning, after long neglect, to find favour again. We should search in vain for its punctual equivalent.

Proclivity is another good old word lately become popular. Sir Walter Scott uses it, to be sure, in *Redgauntlet;* but its resuscitation is due to our countrymen. Englishmen, at first, were amused at its pedantry, and then succumbed to its utility.

Raid, a very old word,—and so *foray*, another,—has lately been revived by Scotch influence. A note appended to it by Dr. Webster's Editors betrays entire ignorance of its extensive currency in England; nor is there any mention made, that it is the same as the old *road*, the last syllable of *inroad*. For this *road*, see 1 *Samuel*, 27, 10, Sir Philip Sidney, Shakespeare, Bacon, Philemon Holland, &c. &c.

Whereabouts, as a substantive, has emerged, in our century, after long desuetude. It has been used by Southey, Wordsworth, Sir Walter Scott, Dr. Arnold, Mr. De Quincey, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, &c. &c.

To the fore is a phrase which, after having long lurked in holes and corners, is now freely used in conversation, and, to some small extent, in books. It occurs in the writings of Mr. De Quincey and Mr. Thackeray. Henry Earl of Monmouth knew it more than two centuries ago. See his *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), p. 416.

[1] It is used by Paley, Southey, Bishop Heber, Lord Macaulay, and many others.

[2] For its correct factitious original, see, as against Mr. R. G. White, my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., p. 45.

Objectivity, with *subjectivity*, *causativity*, *plasticity*, *receptivity*, and several other kindred terms, have come into vogue, during the two last generations, through the influence of German philosophy and æsthetics. *Pervert* has been engendered by that spirit which would mark with reprobation those who transfer their affections from the Protestant doxy to the Roman. And the goats, if they come back to the old sheep-fold, to be reovilized, are now, in pious phrase, denominated *retroverts*.[1] Verbal provision has not yet been made for further metamorphoses. *Physicist*[2] is noteworthy, as a very

[1] Mr. W. E. Gladstone has used *reconverts*. See *The Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review*, Vol. 2 (1843), p. 574.

[2] Akin to *physicist* is *prosaist;* and, inasmuch as *proser* has no chance of being relieved of its dyslogistic purport, it is a word which we shall do well to encourage. It has already been employed by many excellent writers.

And here it is apposite to refer to *specialist*, a speaking example of the tendency of modern English to verbal economy. Scores of similar neoterisms condense, each, half a dozen words into one.

Just above, I have written *dyslogistic;* and, looking to its context, I have written frightful nonsense, provided we are to pin our faith to the dictionaries, as regards its meaning.

In the edition of Walker's *Dictionary* published by Mr. B. H. Smart in 1849, there occurs, at p. 710, among the editor's additions, the following article.

"Dislogistic, *a.* Illogical; undoing, by argument, what seemed to be previously established by it. In the first sense, at least, if not in the second, the word is ill formed."

Dr. Worcester, while omitting the sapient criticism of Mr. Smart, takes from him, with proper acknowledgment, both the word and its definitions; the latter being reduced to "illogical" and "refuting, disproving." Dr. Webster's Editors, who make no reference to Mr. Smart, treat of the word, as if independently, in these terms:

"*Dislogistic, a.* 1. Not according to logical forms or principles; illogical. [*Rare.*]

"2. Serving to disprove; refutatory. [*Rare.*]"

But, "rare", or not, is it quite regular and right? We are not told;

late and very useful neoterism ; and *scientist* is, in every way, a companion to it. In the last century, *physical* meant 'medical', as in the phrase "*physical* phraseology". Then, too, the sense of *naturalist* had nothing of its present explicitness, and, moreover, often signified 'anti-supernaturalist'. Though laying aside the old acceptation of *naturalist*, we have, however, based an adjective on it, in *naturalistic*. *Platitude*[1] we have borrowed from the French, and in this century. With Horace Walpole, it was only a Gallicism. But it is now thoroughly Anglicized; and its offspring, of better or worse repute, *platitudinarian*, *platitudinous*, *platitudinousness*, *platitudinize*, and *platitudinism*, already show their faces in respectable society. A psychologist should find this group of vocables highly instructive. To those who indulge in what Southey calls "damnatory expletives", it is

---

and one would really like to know whether any phenomenal person, as patron of *dislogistic*, and in the senses thus given it, has yet appeared among men. For what has *logistic* to do with *logic*? And, even if *logistic* meant 'logical', what a compound we have in *dislogistic*! From Mr. Smart, who has discovered such words as *chrestomachy* and *curriculus*, his article on "dislogistic" is not at all surprising. But what are we to think of our lexicographers who have followed in his wake? Any respectable scholar, even if *dyslogistic* were new to him, would see, at a glance, that *dislogistic* must be a mistake for it, and that the right word must be the reverse of *eulogistic*. The paternity of *dyslogistic*—no bantling, but now almost a centenarian,—is adjudged to that genius of common-sense, Jeremy Bentham. See his famous *Table of the Springs of Action*.

From what I have here set forth the reader will draw his own inference as to the scholarship and probity which preside over the concoction of our later English dictionaries. And what can be said of the pretentious and gratuitous superstructure which Dr. Webster's Editors have erected on Mr. Smart's little basis of rubbish?

[1] Dr. Worcester takes *platitude* directly from πλατύς. This is like deriving *blame* immediately from βλασφημία.

such oaths as were sworn in Flanders, not your lean piddling profanities, that afford positive relief. And even so, to disburthen one's self of a sense of contempt, a robust full-bodied detonation, like, for instance, *platitudinous*, is, unquestionably, very much more serviceable than any evanescing squib of only one or two syllables. *Plebiscite* we have lately taken, in popular use, from the French. The word previously belonged, however, to the language of the civil law.[1] *Redaction*, imported from France, is a real acquisition to our language. To work up literary matter, and give it a presentable form, is neither compiling, nor editing, nor resetting; and the operation performed on it is exactly expressed by *redaction*. *Solidarity*, also, we have borrowed from the French. *Solidity*, our old word to denote the idea which it conveys, could never, from its ambiguity, find general entertainment. *Solidary*, 'joint and several', if it had got into ordinary literature, and had been felt a desideratum, would very soon have evolved *solidarity*. *Solidary* and *solidity*,[2] though well-known technicalities of the civilians, have escaped the researches of all our lexicographers. *Specie*,[3] irregularly as we have come by it, is now in universal use, and would successfully resist all attempts at displacement. *Veto* is a curious instance, with which *memento* and *caveat* may be compared, of an

[1] See Bishop Hallifax, *An Analysis of the Roman Civil Law* (ed. 1795), p. 5.

[2] See Mr. H. T. Colebrooke, *Treatise on Obligations and Contracts* (1818), pp. 6, 8, 149, 151, 153, for *solidary*; and pp. 7, 146, 149, 152, 157, 201, for *solidity*.

[3] *Vide supra*, p. 254, note 2.

inflected Latin verb taken by us as a base. *Zero* we were prompt to import from Continental Europe, in the absence of any domestic equivalent of it. We have, in it, an interesting example of a foreign and scientific term at once naturalized by necessity, and, to our consciousness, as little a neoterism as the oldest word in our language. Among our myriad of substantives like the foregoing are *abolitionist, absolutist, agriculturist, alarmist, architecturalist, archivist, augurist, aurist, balladist, ballotist, biblicist, capitalist, ceremonialist, circumlocutionist, colloquist, conversationist, criminalist, decimalist, diarist, economist, elegist, epopœist, eulogist, exclusionist, excursionist, facsimilist, frescoist, funambulist, futurist, guitarist, hygeist, indifferentist, individualist, instrumentalist, ironist, larcenist, legendist, magazinist, magnetist, mannerist, memoirist, monologist, neologist, oppositionist, optimist, orientalist, paragraphist, parodist, pessimist, philanthropist, plagiarist, polemist, positivist, propagandist, protectionist, pugilist, reactionist, requisitionist, retrogradist, revisionist, rigorist, routinist, secularist, sentimentalist, sinecurist, socialist, somnambulist, summarist, terrorist, testimonialist, tourist, traditionalist, transcendentalist, vetoist, zoologist; absenteeism, alienism, classicism, colloquialism, favouritism, individualism, mannerism, realism, rusticism, toadyism, ultraism; abandonment,*[1] *accompaniment, apportionment, bedizenment, besotment, embankment, engulfment, enlistment, entailment, maltreatment, puzzlement, recruitment, revictualment;*

[1] *Vide supra*, foot of p. 131.

accountability, anility, canonicity, catholicity, conductivity, constitutionality, conviviality, domesticity, eventuality, excitability, identity, nationality, sentimentality, totality; analysation, arrestation, beautification, civilization, identification, improvisation,[1] *instrumentation, miscalculation, orchestration, seclusion, supersession, unification, vivisection, vocalization; acreage, clientage, frontage, leverage, serfage, sewage, sewerage, windage; apiarian, attitudinarian,*[2] *equalitarian,*[3] *lapsarian, metaphysician, rubrician, statistician, vulgarian; constabulary, dyery, fernery, functionary, grapery, greenery, heathenry,*[4] *jewellery,*[5] *joinery, millinery, perfumery, pinery, rockery, signatary, symbolry, trinketry, veterinary; anthropology, biology, carpology, conchology, cosmology, criminology, ethnology, gastrology, oology, phrenology, sociology; appointee, consignee, examinee, nominee, pledgee; cellaret, cigarette, hydronette, novelette, sermonette, statuette, waggonette; aspirant, celebrant, emigrant,*[6] *executant, postulant; convers-*

[1] Colman used this word in 1786. See *Prose on Several Occasions*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 166.

[2] This was used, however, by Cowper, in 1756, in *The Connoisseur*, No. 138.

[3] Here I should mention *doctrinarian*, used by Dr. Newman. See his *Discussions and Arguments*, &c., p. 19. He is to be commended for his attempt to purge our language of the Gallic *doctrinaire*. With *doctrinarian* compare Southey's *millionist*, spoken of at the foot of p. 183, *supra*.

[4] *Vide supra*, foot of p. 133.

[5] In my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., I have brought together sundry old words terminating with the aggregative syllable *-ry*. I may add the following, all taken from Udall's *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542). *Bawdry*, for 'bawds'. Fol. 46. *Viandry*, for 'viands'. Fol. 28, 55, 86, 185. *Wafry*, for 'wafers'. Fol. 170. *Junkery*, in fol. 104, 131, is the same as Nash's *junquetry*. The base of the first approaches the French *jonchée*; that of the second, the Italian *giuncata*.

[6] *Paley's* use of this word in 1785 was, I suspect, early. See his

ance, insistence, obliviscence, rejuvenescence, reticence, submergence, transference; abettal, deposal, portrayal, reviewal; bureaucracy, diplomacy, impolicy, inerrancy; candidature, fixture,[1] *illiterature;*[2] *heathendom, puzzledom, rascaldom; arboriculture, ostreaculture, pisciculture; pastorate, proletariate; lithograph, photograph; acrobat, aeronaut, affluent, appreciator, aquarium, athlete, break-down, break-up, buffer, census,*[3] *climb, congener, crater, down-pour, dynamics, empty, excerpt, exegete, fisc, floe, gadabout, glacier, guillotine,*[4] *gymnast, heavy, hymnody, iceberg, influenza, kaleidoscope, lagoon, lean-to, makeshift,*[5] *malpractice, mam-*

Moral Philosophy (ed. 1810), Vol. 2, p. 382. Foote, in his Dedication to *The Minor*, has *migrant*, substantive.

[1] This, the modern corrupt substitute for *fixure*, was suggested, most probably, by *mixture*, with which, however, it is not in analogy. *Mixture* is not built on the English *mix*, but on the stem of *mixtum*; and there is no *fixtum*, but *fixum*, on the stem of which to rear a legitimate substantive. Also *vide supra*, p. 130, note 7.

[2] This, synonymous with the unwieldy *unletteredness*, is a word full worth reviving. Its very etymology evidences, that it by no means goes so far as *illiteracy* or *illiterateness*. It has been used by William Taylor, *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 12 (1801), p. 299; by Southey, *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 47 (1832), p. 97; and by Dr. Maitland, somewhere in *The Dark Ages*.

[3] *Cense* is used, by Howell, just as we use *census*. "And the number of graffs which sprung at one time in and about her walls, in a famous *cense* that was made, amounted to above three millions." *Dodona's Grove* (1640), p. 73.

[4] This reminds me of a kindred word which, though only of late become naturalized, was long ago in print.

"That done, throwing a cord about his necke, making use of one of the corners of the chayre, he gave him the *garrote* [*sic*], wherewith he was strangled to death." Mabbe, *The Rogue* (1623), Part 1, p. 266.

[5] This word is far from new, but, I believe, never was common, in its present sense, till recently. Mr. Wright, in his *Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English*, quotes, for it, a book dated in 1609. Dr. Worcester found it in *The Edinburgh Review*. It has been used by James Mill, Charles Lamb, &c. &c.

moth, mountaineering, operative,[1] *outcome, outing, ozone, parachute, peripatetic, prairie, ratal, remand, siding, slum, splash-board, stimulus, strategy, sub-way, swish, telegram,*[2] *terseness, thud, titular, turfite, unwisdom,*[3] *whaler, wrap.*

It would be easy to comment on our new adjectives, also, in much greater detail than I shall here allow myself.

Aggressive is so natural a complement of *aggression* and *aggressor*, that one would suppose it must almost as long have been English.[4] *Anachron-*

But the older use of the word has been overpassed in our lexicography.

"At noone if it bloweth, at night if it shine,
Out trudgeth Hew *Makeshift*, with hook and with line."
Tusser, *Five Hundreth Pointes*, &c., Ch. 15.

"And not longe after, came thither a *make shifte*, with two men wayghting on hym, as very rakehelles as him selfe, bragging that he was a profounde phisicien." John Halle, *An Historiall Expostulation*, &c. (1565), p. 19 (ed. 1844).

"Certainely, it seemeth that London is sore charged with these *makeshiftes*; for that almost in every streate and lane there dwelleth two or three of these pettie brokers or cherish-theeves." George Whetstones, *A Mirour for Magestrates of Cyties* (1584), fol. 33 v.

"Ye play the *makeshiftes*, nay, the murtherers." Henrie Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame* (1592), p. 27 (ed. 1841).

[1] Used by Coleridge. See *The Friend* (ed. 1818), Vol. 3, p. 81.

[2] For a full discussion of this word, see my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., pp. 41—47.

[3] I have met this good old word scores of times, within a year or two, in very modern books, and in newspapers.

[4] It is not at all certain whether the French *agressif* suggested *aggressive*, or was suggested by it. They may have appeared independently of each other.

In *agressif* we have a good sample of the tricks which the French play with proper spelling. As to the word, if they can bear it, why should some of them find an ogre in *progressif*,—the counterpart of *progressive*, which we have had hard on three centuries, if not longer?

"*Progressif* et *progresser* sont dus à l'imagination des idéologues du

ous[1] has, of late, been ventured here and there; and I am greatly mistaken, if it does not answer all the criteria of an acceptable neoterism, harmony included. *Appreciative*, whatever its nationality,[2] established itself, past all extruding, very soon after its introduction. We have a legitimate choice, however, between *appreciative* and *appreciatory*.[3] *Deferential*, like most of our modern words, is analogical in formation, and, unlike many of them, is a really valuable addition to the vocabulary of bygone centuries.[4] *Exceptional* we have wisely adopted from the French, to signify 'implying, constituting, or relating to, an exception or exceptions'.[5] *Financial* has not

---

temps de Franklin, de Malesherbes, et de la guerre d'Amérique. . . . . Ce mot *progressif* est perfide; il s'en faut garder. On commence à dire : un homme *progressif*. *Progressif*, appliqué à des personnes, ne peut désigner que d'excellents marcheurs." M. Wey, *Remarques*, &c., Vol. 1, pp. 447, 448.

At p. 186 of the same volume, there is a separate article on *progresser*, there called "un barbarisme", "un méchant mot", &c. &c.

[1] We have *synchronism* and *synchronous*; and what scholar has not desiderated a manageable adjective to match *anachronism*? *Anachronistic*, obviously, will hardly do, except for holiday wear; and the chances of *anachronic*, which was patronized by William Taylor and Coleridge, are frustrated by *chronic* and its inevitable associations.

With *anachronous* I may name *vicissitous*. But this, as demanding a recondite and tedious argument for its justification, may, like the long-tailed *vicissitudinary* and *vicissitudinous*, be doomed to knock at the public door in vain. Favour is denied it for the very reason which is withdrawing favour from *lenity*, in favour of *lenience*.

[2] In 1856, this word was exhibited, in *Notes and Queries*, as a brand-new Americanism.

[3] Southey has used *appreciant*. *Colloquies*, &c., Vol. 1, p. iv.

[4] See my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., pp. 63—65.

[5] *Exceptive* could never become popular in this sense, by reason of its seeming, more naturally, to mean 'excepting'; just as *connective*, *deceptive*, and *reflective*, for instance, are equivalent to the aoristic participles *connecting*, &c.

I have adverted to Mr. Ruskin and Dr. Johnson, as vicariously ap-

yet been in current use for a hundred years; and rather singularly; inasmuch as *finance* and *financier* have been in the language more than double that period. *Humanitarian*, wider of scope than *philanthropic*, is a word pregnant with significance. *Humanity*, quite as much as *prudence* and *reverence*, stood in need of a secondary adjective.[1] *Industrial*, as a forensic technicality,[2] existed long before the word came into use in its present acceptation. *Industrious* would ill serve the purposes for which we find *industrial* so advantageous. *International* was coined by

---

plying, respectively, *unexceptionable* and *unexceptionably*, at the foot of p. 201, *supra*.

[1] "*Humanitarian* is very strangely perverted by a certain class of speakers and writers. It is a theological word. . . . . But it is used by the people in question, whose example has infected others, as if it meant 'humane', and something more. Now, as the meaning of *humane* is 'recognizing, in a common humanity, a bond of kindness, good will, and good offices', it is difficult to discover what more *humanitarian*, if admitted in this sense, could mean. In brief, *humane* covers the whole ground; and *humanitarian*, used in the sense of 'widely-benevolent and philanthropic', is mere cant, the result of an effort, by certain people, to elevate and to appropriate to themselves a common feeling, by giving it a grand and peculiar name." Mr. R. G. White, *Words and Their Uses*, p. 127.

With the animus of this compare that of M. Wey's remarks on *paupérisme*, quoted in my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., p. 41, foot-note 1. M. Wey, of course, discharges his little pop-gun at *humanitaire*.

Mr. White's argument is, that, since *humane* signifies 'a b c', *humanitarian*, if used as its synonym, signifies nothing more. This is not entirely convincing. *Humanitarian* is no more *humane*, than *humane* is *human*. Is *utilitarian* only *utilis*? And does Archdeacon Hare, by "an *expediential* policy", intend 'an *expedient* policy'? *Humane* and *humanitarian* differ as much as practice and theory. A *humane* action, if the result of principle, is the result of *humanitarian* principle. Conversely, this principle, if not barren, produces fruit in *humane* action. It is the source and power to which such action, when springing from a right motive, is to be referred.

[2] *See* Bishop Hallifax, *An Analysis*, &c., p. 24.

Bentham, who[1] modestly speaks of the word as "new, though not inexpressive."[2] *Nobiliary*, in such a phrase as '*nobiliary* roll,' or '*nobiliary* element of Parliament,' is a term of patent utility, and one to which we should try to habituate ourselves. *Noteworthy*, for a long time abeyant, is now again in common use. *Patriotic*, strange to say, has not yet been current English for three generations.[3]

[1] In his *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, published in 1789.

William Taylor took up the word early in our century. See *The Annual Review*, Vol. 1 (1803), p. 274; Vol. 5 (1807), p. 169.

Codify, *maximize*, and *minimize* may be specially mentioned from among the numerous useful expressions with which Bentham has enriched our language. For their sake, his verbal monstrosities, long ago dead and buried, may be freely pardoned.

[2] Mr. De Quincey, in 1844, on occasion of using the term *inter-repellent*, adds: "The late Mr. Coleridge suggested, and, by his own example, sanctioned, the use of the preposition *inter*, for expressing cases of reciprocal action, or, in his language, of *inter-action*." *The Logic of Political Economy*, p. 18, foot-note.

Surely, we had, *international* apart, *interchange*, *internecine*, &c., long before we had Coleridge. Of late, we have coined largely words like *intercolonial*.

[3] For its presentation as early as 1653, *vide supra*, p. 117, note 5, *ad fin.*

Dr. Johnson did not admit *patriotic* into his Dictionary. As his editor, Archdeacon Todd, observes, however, he "has repeatedly used this word," but "in an ironical way." He uses it, but always sneeringly, to qualify "pleasure", "rage", "tribes", and "vanity". Yet, in his *Taxation no Tyranny*, he means, by "*antipatriotic* prejudices", just what we should mean.

Lord Macaulay, in his most unfair *Essay on Horace Walpole*, gives, as a palmary sample of his Gallicisms: "It will now be seen whether he or they are most *patriot*." But '*most patriotic*' would have seemed almost as odd to Walpole's contemporaries as "most *patriot*" seems to us. To Burke, Gibbon, and Mathias, with many other writers of their age, *patriot* was both a substantive and an adjective, as, in the language of poetry, it is still. Foote, in *The Minor* (1760), makes Snift speak of "a *patriot* gingerbread-baker." "A *patriot* minister". *The Monitor* (1762), No. 357. John Wilkes prefixes *patriot*, in 1763.

Pretentious, a very useful word, and in analogy with *conscientious*, *licentious*, and *sententious*,[1] we have imitated from the French *prétentieux*. *Substantival* and its congeners[2] are secondary adjectives which we owe to the superior exactness of modern grammatical terminology. Further samples of our

---

and 1763, to "toasts", "labours", "spirit", "minister", "club", "stem", "king", "heroes". *The North Briton*, Nos. 15, 18, 32, 36, 39, 41. But "*patriotic* zeal". *Ibid.*, No. 39. In Wilkes's Dedication to Lord Rokeby's *The Fall of Mortimer*, *patriot* qualifies "king", "minister", and "moments". Other references are these. Cole, *The World*, No. 86. Henry Brooke, *The Fool of Quality* (ed. 1792), Vol. 1, p. 250; Vol. 3, pp. 256, 261. Colman, *Prose on Several Occasions*, Vol. 2, p. 31; Vol. 3, pp. 257, 266, 280. George Watson, *England Preserved*, Act 1. Bolingbroke's phrase "*patriot* king" long held its ground.

In the slavish times of George III., *patriots* and *patriotism* were often talked of in a way which would now provoke a stare.

"Political truth is equally in danger from the praises of courtiers and the exclamations of patriots." Dr. Johnson, *Life of Waller*.

"Patriotism and tyranny look opposite ways; and there may be such a thing as a true patriot; but, for the most part, these two are like Samson's foxes, connected by a firebrand, to inflame human affairs, and convert public calamity into private advantage." Rev. William Jones, of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 2, p. 139.

And there is Dr. Johnson's conversational definition of *patriotism*,—"the last refuge of a scoundrel."

[1] According to the newspapers, Mr. Beresford Hope, not long ago, ventured, in the House of Commons, the word *assumptiousness*. Neither does *bumptiousness* nor *presumptuousness*, terms which define two of the honourable gentleman's most salient characteristics, afford him a precedent for his invention.

[2] Among them are *adjectival*, *affixal*, *diminutival*, *imperatival*, *nominatival*, &c. &c. Compare *festival*,—with reference to *festive*,—but merely as to form. The verb *be* is called *substantive*, to denote that it signifies something like 'existence'; a noun is called *adjective*, to mark its species. *Average*, in '*average* rate', grew out of *averagium*, and, therefore, is a *substantival* adjective; *eatables* originated from an adjective, and, hence, is an *adjectival* substantive. These exemplifications are, alone, sufficient to show the utility of the class of words here referred to.

new adjectives are seen in *abnormal, abysmal, accentual, alluvial,*[1] *architectural, biographical, censorial, conversational, denominational, departmental, directorial, discretional, distributional, divisional, emotional, extramural, fictional, fratricidal, functional, governmental, inaugural, inquisitorial, intramural, intuitional, legislatorial, medieval, normal, prelatial, regicidal, sculptural, secretarial,*[2] *sectional, sensational, sentimental, sessional, territorial, transitional, tuitional, typal, zenithal; abeyant, adolescent, afferent, assentient, culminant, dominant,*[3] *flamboyant, grandiloquent,*[4] *hesitant, larmoyant, nascent, originant, persistent, preponderant, presentient, recalcitrant, riant, senescent; aldermanic, archaic, artistic, ceramic, climatic, dynastic, dyspeptic, fistic, operatic, strategic, transatlantic, volcanic;*[5] *barbaresque, gentesque, gigantesque, picturesque, sculpturesque, sermonesque, soldatesque, statuesque; documentary, domiciliary, expeditionary, insurrectionary, reactionary, vestiary; amorphous, cantankerous, eponymous, euphonious, gaseous, monotonous, oragious, uproarious; crotchety, fussy, jerky, markworthy, pudgy, shaky, sketchy,*[6] *skimpy; cleverish, dearish, priggish, raffish, sharpish, wideish; cousinly, fortnightly,*[7] *grand-*

[1] The old word, according to Dr. Johnson, was *alluvious.*

[2] Southey, in 1801, used *secretarian.*

[3] This is a resuscitation; and of the same character are *effete* and *inadmissible.*

[4] Neither Dr. Richardson nor Dr. Latham has this now common word.

[5] The pronunciation of *volcano* with the Italian *a* is a sort of shibboleth of the English nobility. It is amusing, that such die-away people should be distinguishable by their peculiar dealings with a word so suggestive of explosiveness.

[6] This is one of the few neoterisms used by Lord Macaulay.

[7] Dr. Webster's Editors are unacquainted with this adjective. I can

fatherly, waiterly; antipodean, lunarian, reptilian, Tractarian,[1] *utilitarian;*[2] *evasible, regrettable, reliable; exhaustive, precursive, promotive; demented, extortionate, flavoursome, limp,*[3] *nondescript, peninsular, reparatory, sparse, taciturn, truthful, unwifelike.*[4]

Such are some of the words by which living English differs from the English which prevailed in the time of George the Second. It is curious to speculate what will be the contents of a corresponding list, in which the neoterisms of the century then just elapsed shall be exemplified in 1973.

---

testify to its having been in common use, among Englishmen, for a least five and twenty years. Dr. Worcester records it.

[1] Instead of this ill-formed word, I have met with *Tractite* and *Tractator*.

[2] This word—see Mr. J. S. Mill's *Utilitarianism*,—was first used, it is said, by Mr. Galt, in his *Annals of the Parish*.

Like *utilitarian*, many words are no sooner created, as adjectives, than they become substantives, also.

[3] Dr. Worcester calls *limp*, for 'flaccid', 'lithe', "local". It is not so in England.

[4] New adjectives in *-ish*, *-ly*, *-like*, and *-y* are improvised, in conversation, as wanted; and some authors write them as freely as they speak them. By way of curiosity, I give a few in -y,—all of them taken from books,—additional to those in the text. It is not likely that, without exception, they are modern. Old-fashioned lexicographers considered such light expressions as unworthy of their notice.

Baggy, beefy, beery, crackly, dashy, fizzy, flary, flossy, fluffy, gossipy, groggy, headachy, hiccupy, jewelly, mouthy, muzzy, nutty, patchy, peaty, perfumy, pimply, poky, raffy, raggy, rumply, rutty, scrappy, scratchy, shifty, shingly, shrieky, sludgy, spiffy, stagy, thundery, thymy, tricky, viewy, whimmy.

In our days, as compared with former times, colloquialisms get into black and white very largely; but there is no reason to suppose that as many as we now use were not used in past centuries. Richardson's novels deserve special mention, as being a rich storehouse of the conversational dialect of their author's age.

APPENDIX.

ENGLISH IMPERFECTS PASSIVE.

Who is so bold as blind Bayard?—*Old Proverb.*

"ALL really well educated in the English tongue lament the many innovations introduced into our language from America; and I doubt if more than one of these novelties deserve acceptation. That one is, substituting a compound participle for an active verb used in a neuter signification; for instance, 'The house is *being built*,' instead of 'The house *is building*.'" Such is the assertion, and such the opinion, of some anonymous luminary,[1] who, for his liberality in welcoming a supposed Americanism, is somewhat in advance of the herd of his countrymen. Almost any popular expression which is considered as a novelty, a Briton is pretty certain to assume, off-hand, to have originated on our side of the Atlantic. Of the assertion I have quoted, no proof is offered; and there is little probability that its author had any to offer. *Are being*, in the phrase

[1] L. W. K., CLK., LL.D., EX-SCH. T.C.D. Of this reverend gentleman's personality I know nothing. He does not write the most exemplary English, and he does not say exactly what he means; but what he means is, yet, unmistakable. The extract given above is from a letter in *Public Opinion*, Jan. 20, 1866.

"*are being* thrown up,"[1] is spoken of, in *The North American Review*,[2] as "an outrage upon English idiom, 'to be detested, abhorred, execrated, and given over to six thousand' penny-paper editors;" and the fact is, that phrases of the form here pointed at have hitherto enjoyed very much less favour with us than with the English.[3]

As lately as 1860, Dr. Worcester,[4] referring to *is being built*, &c., while acknowledging, that "this new form has been used by some respectable writers," speaks of it as having "been introduced" "within a few years." Mr. Richard Grant White,[5] by a most peculiar process of ratiocination, endeavours to prove, that what Dr. Worcester calls "this new form", came into existence just fifty-six[6] years ago. He

---

[1] The analysis, taken for granted in this quotation, of "are being thrown up" into "are being" and "thrown up," will be dealt with in the sequel, and shown to be untenable.

[2] Vol. 45 (1837), p. 504.

[3] The Rev. John Earle, after quoting, from the offertory-rubric, "while these sentences *are in reading*", adds: "In modern English, we should make it passive, and say 'While these sentences *are being read*'." *The Philology of the English Tongue* (1871), p. 486.

And this is all that the author of the very disappointing work, just quoted, has to say on the interesting point which forms the subject of the present monograph.

In *A School Manual of English Grammar* (1873), Messrs. W. Smith and T. D. Hall insert, as the "Present Tense Incomplete" and the "Past Tense Incomplete", "I *am being beaten*" and "I *was being beaten*", in their Paradigm of the Passive Voice, and simply remark, at p. 49: "This usage is of late introduction into our language."

Dr. R. Morris, in his *Historical Outlines of English Accidence* (ed. 1873), ignores, I believe, these neoteric forms altogether!

[4] In his *Dictionary* (ed. 1860), Preface, p. xxxix.

[5] See his *Words and Their Uses* (1871), Ch. 11, entitled '*Is Being Done*', extending from p. 334 to p. 364.

[6] *This* was written in 1871.

premises,[1] that, in Jarvis's translation of *Don Quixote*, published in 1742, there occurs "were carrying," and that this, in the edition of 1818, is sophisticated into "were being carried." "This change," continues our logician, "and the appearance of *is being* with a perfect participle, in a very few books published between A.D. 1815 and 1820, indicate the former period as that of the origin of this phraseology, which, although more than half a century old, is still pronounced a novelty as well as a nuisance."[2]

---

[1] He begins with saying: "The latter course of this idiom of *in*, *on*, or *a* with the verbal noun may be traced, and the period of the concoction of *is being* may be determined, by a comparison of the heading of chapter xxii. of *Don Quixote*, as it appears in the principal English translations."

"Determined" has since been altered to "approximated", for reasons shown in the next note. But alteration is still needed. It does not follow, because A, in 1742, wrote *were carrying*, and B, in 1818, wrote *were being carried*, that B's expression was unknown to A.

[2] In the new edition of *Words and Their Uses*, published towards the end of last year, we find, at p. 348, instead of the sentence quoted above:

"This change indicates the latter part of the seventeenth [*read* eighteenth] century, as the birth-time of *is being*. And, in fact, the earliest known instance of its use occurs in a letter by Southey, dated 1795. Coleridge used it, and Lamb, and Landor; yet, after three quarters of a century, it is pronounced a novelty and a nuisance."

The facts about Southey, Coleridge, Lamb, and Landor, the reader will find at pp. 326, 327, *infra*; but Mr. White, while pillaging from me, nowhere even names or alludes to me.

A reviewer in *The Nation*, May 15, 1873, writes thus:

"Mr. White, however, is not absolutely inaccessible to instruction from his critics. Dr. Hall's elaborate refutation of his argument against *is being*, published in *Scribner's Monthly*, a year ago,—the subject is, therefore, only alluded to, not reargued, in the present brochure,—has been so far taken to heart, by him, that he now (p. 337) declares the phrase to have begun 'about seventy or eighty years ago', instead of, as in the first edition, 'about fifty years ago, as I infer,' to distress and torture every tasteful and reasonable friend of correct English. He might well, we think, have given Dr. Hall credit.

Who, in the next place, devised our modern imperfects passive? The question is not, originally, of my asking; but, as the learned are at open feud on the subject, it should not be passed by in silence. Its deviser is, more than likely, as undiscoverable as the name of the valiant antediluvian who first tasted an oyster. But the deducible character of the miscreant is another thing; and hereon there is war between the philosophers. Mr. G. P. Marsh,[1] as if he had actually spotted the wretched creature, passionately and categorically denounces him as "some grammatical pretender." "But," replies Mr. White, "that it is the work of any grammarian is more than doubtful. Grammarians, with all their faults, do not deform language with fantastic solecisms, or even seek to enrich it with new and startling verbal combinations. They rather resist novelty, and devote themselves to formulating that which use has already established. It can hardly be, that such an incongruous and ridiculous form of speech as *is being done* was contrived by a man who, by any stretching of the name, should be included among grammarians." In the same page with this, Mr. White vituperates the great unknown as "some precise and feeble-

for suggesting this alteration of date, particularly as he does not draw an additional particle of profit from the counter-argument. This whole matter is thoroughly characteristic of Mr. White."

But Mr. White, even when he pilfers, makes an ill use of his booty. For how does the change, in the edition of Jarvis's *Don Quixote* published in 1818, into *were being carried*, from the *were carrying* of the edition of 1742, "indicate the latter part of the eighteenth century, as the birth-time of *is being*"? Mr. White's later logic is no improvement on his early.

[1] *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 649.

minded soul," and elsewhere calls him "some pedantic writer of the last generation." To add even one word towards a solution of the knotty point here indicated transcends, I confess, my utmost competence; and all the world, quite possibly, must be content to share my helplessness. Nero, Heliogabalus, Changhez Khan, and Alva are properties of history; but, in all likelihood, we shall labour in vain to discover the Attila of speech who, by his *is being built*, or *is being done*, first offered violence to the whole circle of the proprieties.

Dr. Priestley, in the last edition of his *Rudiments of English Grammar*, which came out in 1772, takes no notice of locutions like those in question; and none is taken by the Rev. John Bretland, in his enlarged edition of the aforesaid work, published in 1785. If Priestley had ever heard such locutions, he would, doubtless, have remarked on them. Whether they had arisen, or not, in 1785, I am unprepared to say; but, as I shall show, they were beginning to have vogue only ten years later.[1]

---

[1] In a portion of Jeremy Bentham's *Church-of-Englandism and its Catechism Examined*, &c., republished in 1868, we read, at p. 69: "*are* every day *being consumed*". The original work first appeared about 1788; and even the editions of 1818 and 1824 have "*are* every day *consuming*".

In Matthew G. Lewis's *Journal of a West India Proprietor* (ed. 1834), p. 129, in a letter bearing the date of 1816, is the expression "while breakfast *was getting* ready". A later edition changes this into "while breakfast *was being got* ready."

An elegant London edition of *The Vicar of Wakefield*, printed in 1855, gives, in Ch. 25: "The little money I had *was* very *nearly being* all *exhausted*." Goldsmith, I find, wrote "near"; and, by the substitution of "nearly", the expression "was being exhausted" is foisted upon him, and to the utter perversion of his meaning.

How soon they were recognized by grammarians ought to be ascertainable at the expense of a few hours' questing in such a library as that of the British Museum. So far as I have observed, the earliest Grammar which exhibits them is that of Mr. R. S. Skillern, M.A., the first edition of which was published at Gloucester, in 1802. We there find, in the paradigm of the passive voice, "to be being conquered," "I am being conquered," "I was being conquered," "I shall or will be being conquered," "I can, may, or must be being conquered," &c., &c. Most of these forms must come among those which the author admits that he inserted for the sake of theoretical completeness. He nowhere invites special attention to any of them.

Robert Southey had not, on the ninth of October, 1795, been out of his minority quite two months, when, evidently delivering himself in a way which had already become familiar enough, he wrote of "a fellow whose uttermost upper grinder *is being torn out* by the roots by a mutton-fisted barber."[1] This is from a private letter. In a work which Southey published two years later, we read: "He *is* now *being educated* for a Catholic priest."[2]

Editors of modern literature, until very recently, have rarely been noted for scrupulous fidelity. Hundreds of authors, no question, have been tampered with like Clarendon, Madame de Sevigné, Gray, and Washington.

[1] *The Life and Correspondence of the late Robert Southey*, Vol. 1, p. 249.

[2] *Letters*, &c. (1797), p. 372. I might appeal largely to Southey's private letters; but, for further testimonies, I confine myself to his compositions of a more formal cast.

"Plans and elevations of their palace, and of the new temple, have

"While my hand *was being drest* by Mr. Young, I spoke for the first time," wrote Coleridge,[1] in March, 1797.

Charles Lamb speaks of realities which "*are being acted* before us,"[2] and of "a man who *is being strangled.*"[3]

Walter Savage Landor, in an imaginary conversation, represents Pitt as saying: "The man who possesses them may read Swedenborg and Kant, while he *is being tossed* in a blanket."[4] Again: "I have seen nobles, men and women, kneeling in the street, before these bishops, when no ceremony of the Catholic Church *was being performed.*"[5] Also, in a translation from Catullus:

"Some criminal *is being tried*
For murder."[6]

"We were allowed two hours for dinner; and two more were wasted in the evening, while the

---

been made for them, and *are* now *being engraved* for the public." *Espriella's Letters*, &c. (1807), Vol. 3, p. 266.

"Volumes have been filled, and *are* perpetually *being filled*," &c. *Life of Wesley* (ed. 1864), Vol. 2, p. 281.

"Such . . at this time *are being reestablished.*" *Colloquies*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 338.

"It is needed alike for those who *are being trained* in our seminaries," &c. *Cowper's Works*, Vol. 1, p. 8.

"She has been carried from lecture to lecture, like a student who *is being crammed* at a Scotch University." *The Doctor* (ed. 1849), p. 38.

"That verb *is* eternally *being declined.*" *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[1] *Biographia Literaria* (ed. 1847), Vol. 2, p. 317.

[2] *Elia's Essays*, Stage Illusions.

[3] *Ibid.*, On the Inconveniences Resulting from Being Hanged.

[4] *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 376.

[5] *The Letters of a Conservative*, p. 88.

[6] *The Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 262.

coach *was being changed.*" So writes Mrs. Shelley.[1]

And Shelley, in 1819: "My Prometheus, which has been long finished, *is* now *being transcribed,* and will soon be forwarded to you for publication."[2]

The critical Dr. Arnold has: "For instance, what lies at the bottom of that question which *is* now *being discussed* everywhere,—the question of the corn-laws,—but the geological fact, that England is more richly supplied with coal-mines than any other country in the world?"[3]

Nor does Mr. De Quincey scruple at such English as "made and *being made,*"[4] and "the bride that *was being married* to him."[5] On one occasion, he writes "not done, not even (according to modern purism) *being done;*"[6] as if *purism* meant 'exactness,' rather than 'the finical avoidance of neoterism.'

I need, surely, name no more, among the dead, who found *is being built,* or the like, acceptable. "Simple-minded common people and those of culture were alike protected against it by their attachment to

---

[1] *History of a Six Weeks' Tour,* &c. (1817), p. 72.

[2] *Shelley Memorials,* p. 118.

[3] *Introductory Lectures on Modern History* (ed. 1845), pp. 126, 127. Also see *Miscellaneous Works,* p. 121.

Shelley, Mrs. Shelley, and Dr. Arnold are not named by Mr. White, —*vide supra,* p. 323, note 2,—in his list of early users, among good writers, of *is being,* &c. The passages which I now take from them were not given in my first edition of the present paper. My extracts from Mr. De Quincey Mr. White shuts his eyes to. It would not have done for him to let it be known that a writer so highly esteemed in America differed from himself.

[4] *Works,* Vol. 7, p. 111.

[5] *Ibid.,* Vol. 13, p. 232, second foot-note. Somewhere else, Mr. De Quincey writes: "The shafts of Heaven *were* even now *being forged.*" My reference to the passage I have mislaid.

[6] *Works,* Vol. 4, p. 7.

the idiom of their mother-tongue, with which they felt it to be directly at variance."[1] So Mr. White informs us. But the writers whom I have quoted are formidable exceptions. Even Mr. White will scarcely deny to them the title of "people of culture."

So much for offenders past repentance; and we all know, that the sort of phraseology under consideration is daily becoming more and more common. The best-written of the English reviews, magazines, and journals are perpetually marked by it; and some of the choicest of living English writers employ it freely.

Preeminent among these stands Dr. Newman, who wrote, as far back as 1846: "At this very moment, souls *are being led* into the Catholic Church, on the most various and independent impulses, and from the most opposite directions."[2]

Bishop Wilberforce shall be summoned next. "How plainly, in this case, *is* the work of evil *being accomplished* in our soul, and all hope of the continu-

[1] And this language Mr. White repeats in 1872, when in possession of the facts as to Southey, Coleridge, Lamb, and Landor, which he plagiarizes from me.

In his new edition, Mr. White boldly insinuates that expressions like *is being built* are, even at this day, somewhat peculiar to very low persons:

"This 'continuing passive present' seems to be fastened upon us; those who inaugurate 'sample-rooms', or who report the proceedings on those occasions, being instant in its use, and seizing every opportunity of airing their precision." P. 413, foot-note.

By *sample-rooms* are meant, in New York slang, 'grog-shops'. In Mr. White's opinion, either the keepers of such places, or else their newspaper-puffers, must be influential indeed, if they can really "fasten" any mode of speech on the people at large.

[2] *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. 2, p. 448.

ance of a faithful and prosperous ministry *being destroyed*."[1] "The true evil *is being wrought*."[2] "It is acting the evil which *is being accomplished* within him."[3] "Perhaps this last issue *is being* now *decided* for us, as a nation."[4]

From Mr. Ruskin I take one instance of similar phraseology, and refer to fifteen more. "Now, during the whole period in which the ground *is being recovered*," &c.[5]

"Italy *is being annexed* to Sardinia by its own free will," says the Rev. Dr. E. A. Freeman.[6]

"The king of Dahomey sips sugar and water, whilst a hundred human beings *are being massacred* before his eyes, and their blood *is being puddled* with the blood of tigers." So the Rev. S. Baring-Gould.[7]

Mr. Matthew Arnold writes: "Any one, for instance, who will go to the Potteries, and will look at the tawdry, glaring, ill-proportioned ware which *is being made* there," &c.[8]

"The corpuscles enter into the eggs, while they *are being formed*," is the language of Professor Huxley, in his account of the panhistophyton.[9]

---

[1] *Addresses*, &c. (ed. 1860), p. 225.

[2] *Sermons*, &c., Second Series (1863), p. 48.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[5] *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849), p. 142. Also see *Lectures on Architecture and Painting* (1854), p. 70: *The Two Paths* (1859), pp. 14, 68, 155, 228: *Ethics of the Dust* (1866), pp. 22, 102, 108, 190, 198, 203: *Sesame and Lilies* (ed. 1871), pp. 21, 97: *The Eagle's Nest* (1872), p. 67: *Fors Clavigera*, Letter 29, p. 2.

[6] *Historical Essays*, Vol. 1, p. 167. Also see pp. 122, 237. The three passages referred to were written in 1860, 1869, and 1871.

[7] *The Origin and Development of Religious Belief* (ed. 1871), p. 77.

[8] *Literature and Dogma*, p. 55.

[9] *Critiques and Addresses* (1873), p. 247.

Lord Macaulay, Mr. Dickens, *The Atlantic Monthly*, and *The Brooklyn Eagle* are alleged by Mr. White, after having given extracts from Bishop Jewell downwards, in proof that people still use such phrases as "Chelsea Hospital *was building*," and "the train *was preparing*." "Hence we see," he adds, "that the form *is being done, is being made, is being built*, lacks the support of authoritative usage from the period of the earliest classical English to the present day." I fully concur with Mr. White, in regarding "neither *The Brooklyn Eagle* nor Mr. Dickens as a very high authority in the use of language;" yet, when he has renounced the aid of these contemned straws, what, by his argument, has he to rest his inference on, as to our own day, but the practice of Lord Macaulay and *The Atlantic Monthly?* Those who think fit will bow to the dictatorship here prescribed to them; but there may be those with whom the classic sanction of Southey, Landor, Dr. Newman, and Mr. Matthew Arnold will not be wholly void of weight. Fox, when he resolved to put on paper no word which had not the warrant of Dryden, decided for himself alone. Mr. White out-Foxes Fox.

All scholars are aware, that, to convey the sense of the imperfects passive, our ancestors, centuries ago, prefixed, with *is*, &c., *in*, afterwards corrupted into

---

See, further, the Rev. Charles Kingsley, *The Hermits*, pp. 18, 34: Mr. Henry Crabbe Robinson, *Diary*, &c., Vol. 1, p. 502; Vol. 2, p. 367. And I might refer to Beckford, Sir John Davis, Mr. Dickens, Mr. Thackeray, Mr. Carlyle, &c. &c. &c. There are twelve instances in Mr. Charles Reade's *Hard Cash*, and others in *The Course of True Love*, &c., *The Eighth Commandment*, *Put Yourself in His Place*, *Griffith Gaunt*, &c.

a, to a verbal substantive. 'The house *is in building*' could be taken to mean nothing but *ædes ædificantur;* and, when the *in* gave place to *a*,[1] it was still manifest enough, from the context, that *building* was governed by a preposition. The second stage of change, however, namely, when the *a* was omitted, entailed, in many cases, great danger of confusion.[2] In the early part of the last century, when English was undergoing what was then thought to be purification, the polite world substantially resigned *is a-building*, especially in its passive sense, to the vulgar.[3]

[1] Thomas Fuller writes: "At his arrivall, the last stake of the Christians was on *losing*." *The Historie of the Holy Warre* (ed. 1647), p. 218.

[2] In the Geneva *New Testament*, 1 St. Peter, 3, 20, is the expression "while the arcke *was preparing*." And so the passage is reproduced in Bagster's *Hexapla*, where, Mr. Marsh supposes, "*preparing* .... is, probably, a misprint for *a-preparing;* as no other example of that form is known to occur until long after the date of that version." *Lectures*, &c., p. 651, foot-note.

There is no misprint, I find, on reference to the original edition of 1557; and Mr. Marsh is mistaken in thinking that such a form as *preparing* for *a-preparing*, was not in use till long after that date.

"Or els, whyles a commodye of Plautus *is playinge*, and the vyle bondemen skoffynge and tryffelinge amonge them selfes," &c. Raphe Robynson, Translation of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1551), p. 64 (ed. 1869).

"There was talking of a monasterie that *was erecting* in the honour of hym." *Pasquine in a Traunce* (ed. 1566), fol. 17.

"And yet was there one [pageant] much fayrer, that *was preparing* for Peter Lewes," &c. *Ibid.*, fol. 101.

"He was worthily received by Pontus, duke and gouvernour of the same ile, with whom he lodged while his shippes *were* newe *repairyng*." Barnabe Riche, *Farewell to Militarie Profession* (1581), p. 69 (ed. 1846).

"In the meane space, while these things *were providing*, he trimmed the maine mast of the Jesus, which, in the storme aforesaid, was sprong." Sir John Hawkins, in Hakluyt, Vol. 1 (1589), p. 524.

[3] "Noble is thy *bringing uppe* as is thy *raising* to high fortunes." Dekker, *The Dead Tearme* (1608), sig. C 4 v.

Towards the close of the same century, when, under the influence of free thought, it began to be felt that even ideas had a right to faithful and unequivocal representation, a just resentment of ambiguity was evidenced in the creation of *is being built*. The lament is too late, that the instinct of reformation did not restore the old form. It is gone for ever; and we are now to make the best of its successors.. "'The brass *is forging*,'" in the opinion of Dr. Johnson, is "a vicious expression, probably corrupted from a phrase more pure, but now somewhat obsolete, . . . 'the brass *is a-forging*.'" Yet, with a true Tory's timidity, and aversion to change, it is not surprising that he went on preferring what he found established, vicious as it confessedly was, to the end. But was the expression "vicious," solely because it was a corruption? In 1787, William Beckford wrote as follows, of the fortune-tellers of Lisbon: "*I saw one dragging into light*, as I passed by the ruins of a palace thrown down by the earthquake. Whether a familiar of the Inquisition was griping her in his clutches, or *whether she was taking to account by some disappointed votary*, I will not pretend to answer."[1] Are the expressions here italicized either perspicuous or graceful? Whatever we are to have in their place, we should be thankful to get quit of them.

Inasmuch as, concurrently with *building* for the active participle, and *being built* for the correspond-

We still use the former, but no longer the latter, of the expressions italicized. For *raising* we could here substitute neither 'rising' nor 'being raised'. We should put 'elevation', meaning 'elevatedness'.

[1] *Italy*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 89.

ing passive participle, we possessed the former, with *is* prefixed, as the active present imperfect, it is in rigid accordance with the symmetry of our verb, that, to construct the passive present imperfect, we prefix *is* to the latter, producing the form *is being built*. Such, in its greatest simplicity, is the procedure which, as will be seen, has provoked a very levanter of ire and vilification. But anything that is new will be excepted to by minds of a certain order. Their tremulous and impatient dread of removing ancient landmarks disqualifies them even for thoroughly investigating its character and pretensions. It is not impossible to imagine, that the primeval practitioners of articulate speech themselves were frowned on, with severe displeasure, by sturdy conservatives who had determined to be content with the language of pantomime. And theoretical admirers of the prelingual period are, possibly, scattered here and there, to this day. "Unless a man," writes Mr. White, "is a monster of pedantry and priggishness,—and, indeed, not then,—the words and the forms of speech he uses are not made, or even chosen, by himself."[1] But, as "words" and "forms of speech," that is to say, language, are made, and are, most assuredly, not the work of pedants and prigs, their origin must be extrahuman. As to *is being built*, it is, presumably, not to the class of those expressions which, with *γνῶθι σεαυτόν*, streamed down from

[1] "Any man has the right to use a word, especially a word of such natural growth and so well rooted as *juxtapose*, for the first time; else we should be poorly off for language." *Words and Their Uses*, p. 259.

How is this to be reconciled with the doctrine quoted in the text?

Heaven, but to the class of those which steamed up from Tartarus, that Mr. White would assign it.

In *is building* and in *is being built*, we have an auxiliary followed by the active participle present and by the passive participle present, just as, in *will build* and in *will be built*, we have an auxiliary followed by the active infinitive and by the passive infinitive. And then there is *has been built*, paired against *has built*.[1] To come to analysis, *will be built* and *has been built*, considered as equivalent to *will be* + *built* and *has been* + *built*, would signify something like[2] *will*

[1] Though, of these concretions, as such, the latter, *has built*, is active, I cannot consent with the grammarians in so calling the participle, *built*, which it embodies. The real reason why *built* may be an element of an active concretion, no less than of a passive concretion, is, that, taken unqualified by *have* or *be*, it is static; as in 'a *built* house', 'I found the house *built*', where *built*, in essence and function, is indistinguishable from an adjective.

I would here refer, for an admirable exposition of the dichotomy of the parts of speech into static and dynamic, to Dr. Shadworth H. Hodgson's *Theory of Practice*, Vol. 2, Ch. 4, Para. 93.

[2] I express myself in this manner, because I distinguish between *be* and *exist*. As well might one deny that they differ, as deny a difference between *esse* and *existere*. When we assert that a thing *exists*, we denote, respecting it, a degree of protension in time, or of prominence of presentation, which is clearly absent from the consciousness, when we assert that the thing *is*. Moreover, *exist*, refusing to derogate from its original character, and to surrender its substantive rights, will not submit to be attenuated into a mere link of connexion; whereas *be* divests itself readily of its dynamic robustness, humbles itself to become a simple copula, and, as such, is equally fitted to form a constituent of a verb active, of a verb passive, and of a verb neuter, or, in other words, to subserve the full expression of energy, recipiency of energy, and objectless activity.

Horne Tooke says he would "rather chuse, in the scale of beings, to *exist* a mastiff or a mule, than a monkey or a lap-dog." Hereon Mr. White comments, that "no man who has preserved all his senses will doubt, for a moment, that, 'to *exist* a mastiff or a mule' is absolutely the same as 'to *be* a mastiff or a mule.'" I, for one, must, then, have parted with some portion of my senses. But I am comforted by the

exist built and *has existed built*, which, plainly, are neuter. We are debarred, therefore, from such resolutions; and, by parity of reasoning, we may not analyse *is being built* into *is being* + *built*. It must have been an inspiration of analogy, felt or unfelt, that suggested the form I am discussing. *Is being* + *built*, as it can mean, pretty nearly, only *exists built*, would never have been proposed as adequate to convey any but a neuter sense; whereas it was perfectly natural for a person aiming to express a passive sense, to prefix *is* to the passive concretion *being built*.[1]

---

conviction, that I have a goodly fellowship of unacknowledged bedlamites to bear me company.

Mr. White, since reading my remarks on his extract from Horne Tooke, has altered the passage quoted above. It now runs: "can any man who has preserved all his senses doubt, . . . ?" This substitution of the interrogative address for the affirmative indicates a modified view of insanity, certainly; but, in stopping short of complete excision, Mr. White has also indicated, that, whereas '*is* inapprehensive' was formerly to be predicated of him, we are now compelled to predicate '*exists* inapprehensive'.

"The identity of thesis and antithesis is the substance of all *being*; their opposition, the condition of all *existence*, or *being manifested*;" &c. Coleridge, *The Friend* (ed. 1818), Vol. 1, p. 155.

[1] Samuel Richardson writes: "Jenny, who attends me here, has more than once hinted to me, that Miss Jervois loves to sit up late, either reading or *being read to* by Anne, who, tho' she reads well, is not fond of the task." *Sir Charles Grandison* (ed. 1754), Vol. 3, p. 46.

▸ The transition is very slight by which we pass from 'sits being read to' to 'is being read to.'

The idiom formed by the adjection of a present participle to *being*, for the purpose of expressing continuous action, may here be relevantly adverted to. Examples of it are abundant.

"*Being gaping* a-slepe." Bishop Bale, *The Vocacyon*, &c. (1553), *The Harleian Miscellany* (ed. Oldys and Park), Vol. 6, p. 457.

"Robin Good-fellow *being walking*, one night," &c. *Robin Good-fellow*, &c. (bef. 1588 ?), p. 38 (ed. 1841).

"*Being eating* of oysters", "*being a-carousing*." *Tarlton's Jests*, &c. (ed. Mr. J. O. Halliwell), pp. 6, 8.

GENERAL L
Universi
MICHIG

The analogical justification of *is being built* which I have brought forward is so obvious, that, as it occurred to myself more than twenty years ago, so it must have occurred spontaneously to hundreds besides. It is very singular that those who, like Mr. Marsh and Mr. White, have pondered long and painfully over locutions typified by *is being built*, should have missed the real ground of their grammatical defensibleness, and should have warmed themselves, in their opposition to them, into uttering opinions which no calm judgment can accept.

"One who *is being beaten*" is, to Archbishop Whately, "uncouth English." "'The bridge *is being built*,' and other phrases of the like kind, have pained the eye" of Mr. David Booth. Such phrases, according to Mr. M. Harrison, "are not English." To Professor J. W. Gibbs, "this mode of expression . . . . appears formal and pedantic;" and "the easy and natural expression is, 'The house *is building*.'"[1] In all this, little or nothing is discernible beyond sheer prejudice, the prejudice of those who

---

"*Being* then *preaching*." Thomas Fuller, *Abel Redevivus*, p. 229.

"Two large wax candles were also set on another table, the ladies *being going* to cards." De Foe, *The Political History of the Devil* (ed. 1840), p. 336.

"After which, the sun *being* now *setting*," &c. Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote* (ed. 1820), Vol. 2, p. 193.

"Merchant, with some rudeness, demanded a room, and was told that there was a good fire in the next parlour, which the company were about to leave, *being* then *paying* their reckoning." Dr. Johnson, *Life of Savage*.

These extracts illustrate forcibly what nice distinctions of tense we are enabled, by the flexibility of our conjugation, to give expression to.

[1] I am here indebted to Dr. Worcester's *Dictionary*, Preface, p. xxxix.

resolve to take their stand, quite regardless of utility, against an innovation, simply because it is an innovation, and who are ready to find an argument against it in any random epithet of disparagement provoked by unreflecting aversion. And the more recent denouncers in the same line have no more reason on their side than their elder brethren.

In Mr. Marsh's estimation, *is being built* illustrates "corruption of language;" it is "clumsy and unidiomatic;"[1] it is, "at best, but a philological coxcombry;"[2] it "is an awkward neologism, which neither convenience, intelligibility, nor syntactical congruity demands, and the use of which ought, therefore, to be discountenanced, as an attempt at the artificial improvement of the language, in a point which needed no amendment."[3] Again: "To reject" *is building*, in favour of the modern phrase, "is to violate the laws of language by an arbitrary change; and, in this particular case, the proposed substitute is at war with the genius of the English tongue."[4] Mr. Marsh seems to fancy, that, wherever he intimates a beauty in *is building*, he points out, inclusively, a blemish in *is being built*.

The fervour with which Mr. White advances to the charge is altogether tropical. "The full absurdity of this phrase, the essence of its nonsense, seems not to have been hitherto pointed out." It is "a new phrase which has nothing of force or of accuracy in its favour." It is not "consistent with

[1] *Lectures*, &c., p. 649. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 664. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 649.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 656. It is quite beyond me to conjecture in what sense Mr. Marsh here talks of "an arbitrary change."

reason;" and it is not "conformed to the normal development of the language." It is "a monstrosity, the illogical, confusing, inaccurate, unidiomatic character of which I have, at some length, but yet imperfectly, set forth." "In fact, it means nothing, and is the most incongruous combination of words and ideas that ever attained respectable usage in any civilized language." These be "prave 'ords;" and it seems a pity that so much sterling objurgatory ammunition should be expended in vain. And that it is so expended thinks Mr. White himself; for, though passing sentence in the spirit of a Jeffreys, he is not, really, on the judgment-seat, but on the lowest hassock of despair. As concerns the mode of expression exemplified by *is being built*, he owns, that, "to check its diffusion would be a hopeless undertaking." If so, why not reserve himself for service against some evil not avowedly beyond remedy?

Again we read: "Some precise and feeble-minded soul, having been taught that there is a passive voice in English, and that, for instance, *building* is an active participle, and *builded* or *built* a passive, felt conscientious scruples at saying 'the house *is building*.' For what could the house build?" As children say at play, Mr. White burns here. A participle it was, no question, though not *built*, but *being built*, that excited, in his hypothetical "precise and feeble-minded soul," "conscientious scruples at saying 'the house *is building*';" and, if Mr. White had hit upon the right participle, I suspect his chapter on *Is Being Done* would have been much shorter than it is at

present, and very different. "The fatal absurdity in this phrase" consists, he tells us, "in the combination of *is* with *being*;[1] in the making of the verb *to be* a supplement,[2] or, in grammarians' phrase, an auxiliary to itself,[3]—an absurdity so palpable, so monstrous, so ridiculous, that it should need only to be pointed out to be scouted." Lastly: "The question is, thus, narrowed simply to this: Does *to be*

---

[1] "This *is being* wicked for wickedness' sake." Charles Johnson, *Chrysal* (ed. 1777), vol. 2, p. 65.

"This *is being* candid indeed." Miss Burney, *Cecilia*, Book 3, Ch. 7.

And so we all say every day; perpetrating, with "fatal absurdity," "the combination of *is* with *being*."

[2] Changed, in Mr. White's new edition, into "complement." The first reading gave rise to my remark, in 1871, at the end of note 1 in the next page.

[3] By what linguistic criterion, I beg to know, is such a "supplement" as Mr. White refers to made out to be an absurdity? No one is better aware than the true philologist, of the hazard attending generalizations and universal assertions. In Hindî and Urdû, 'becoming' is *hotâ huá*, literally, 'being been'; the present imperfect is *maiṇ hotâ hûṇ*, literally, 'I am being'; 'I had been' is *maiṇ huâ thâ*, literally, 'I was been'; 'I may have been' is *maiṇ huâ hûṇgâ*, literally, 'I shall be been', &c. &c. So, in Persian, 'I had been' is *shudah bûdam*, literally, 'I was having been'; 'I shall have been' is *bûdah bâsham*, literally, 'I may be having been'.

I shall recur, a little further on, to the point here adverted to. In the mean time, I will only add, that I need not have gone to Asia for facts subversive of Mr. White's assumption. Even the neo-Latin languages are, more than one of them, conclusive as against it; and so is the German.

Is being thus has many parallels in language. In this expression, of two parts of a verb, one is made to qualify the other, just as in *has had*. If, then, *is being* is absurd to Mr. White, the old-fashioned *has had* ought to be equally absurd to him; for the self-qualification of, in Mr. White's phraseology, "simple absolute existence, or whatever attribute follows it," must be quite on a par with the qualification of possession by possession: if 'existent beings' is not to be borne, neither is 'having possessions.' And still worse, to him, should be *is becoming*, in which 'simple absolute existence' qualifies process. For *who* can imagine a condition of simultaneous station and motion?

being (*esse ens*) mean anything more or other than *to be?*"

Having convicted Mr. White of a mistaken analysis, I am not concerned with the observations which he founds on his mistake. However, even if his analysis had been correct, some of his arguments would avail him nothing. For instance, *is being built*, on his understanding of it, that is to say, *is being* + *built*, he represents by *ens ædificatus est*, as "the supposed corresponding Latin phrase."[1] The Latin is illegitimate; and he infers, that, therefore, the English is the same. But *ædificans est*, a translation, on the model which he offers, of the active *is building*, is quite as illegitimate as *ens ædificatus est*.[2] By parity of non-sequitur, we are, therefore, to surrender the active *is building*. Assume that a phrase in a given language is indefensible, unless it has its

[1] "*It is being* is simply equal to *it is*. And, in the supposed corresponding Latin phrases, *ens factus est*, *ens ædificatus est* (the obsoleteness of *ens*, as a participle, being granted), the monstrosity is not in the use of *ens* with *factus*, but in that of *ens* with *est*. The absurdity is, in Latin, just what it is in English, the use of *is* with *being*, the making of the verb *to be* a complement to itself."

In writing thus, Mr. White recognizes no more difference between *supplement* and *complement* than he recognizes between *be* and *exist*. See the preceding page, note 2, and p. 335, note 2, *supra*.

[2] *Is being done*, we are told, "is a worthy offspring of English grammar; a fitting, and, I may say, an inevitable, consequence of the attempt to make our mother-tongue order herself by Latin rules and standards."

What is there in Latin,—which helplessly leaves it doubtful whether *amor* is to mean 'I am loved', or 'I am being loved',—to suggest *is being done?* This very doubtfulness, if anything.

Mr. White is unfortunate in his Latin. But where is he not unfortunate? The French *se bâtissait*, and the Italian *s'edificava* and *s'apparecchiava*, he takes to be preterites, and translates them by "was built" and "was prepared."

counterpart in some other language; from the very conception and definition of an idiom, every idiom is illegitimate.[1]

I now pass to another point. "*To be* and *to exist* are," to Mr. White's apprehension, "perfect synonyms, or more nearly perfect, perhaps, than any two verbs in the language.[2] In some of their meanings, there is a shade of difference; but, in others, there is none whatever; and the latter are those which serve our present purpose. When we say, 'He, *being* forewarned of danger, fled,' we say, 'He, *existing* forewarned of danger, fled.' When we say, that a thing *is* done, we say that it *exists* done. When we say, 'That *being done*, I shall be satisfied,' we say, 'That *existing done*, I shall be satisfied.' *Is being done* is simply *exists existing done*." But, if *is* and *exists* be equipollent, and so *being* and *existing*, *is being* is the same as the unimpeachable *is existing*. Q. *non* E. D. *Is existing* ought, of course, to be no less objectionable, to Mr. White, than *is being*. Just as absurd, too, should he reckon the Italian *sono stato*, *era stato*, *sia stato*, *fossi stato*, *saro stato*, *sarei stato*, *essere stato*, and *essendo stato*. For, in Italian, both *essere* and *stare* are required to make

[1] I here use *idiom* in its strictest acceptation. "By *idiom* is meant that use of words which is peculiar to a particular language." Dr. J. H. Newman, *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects*, p. 160.

"Every language, more especially the English, has its *idioms*, which we should not register, with grammarians and lexicographers, among its irregularities, but, with poets and orators, number among its beauties." Colman, *The Gentleman*, No. 3.

[2] In his new edition, Mr. White has: "*To be* and *to exist*, if not perfect synonyms, are more nearly so, perhaps, than any two verbs in the language."

up the verb substantive,[1] as, in Latin, both *esse* and the offspring of *fuere* are required;[2] and *stare*, primarily, 'to stand,' is modified into a true auxiliary.[3] The alleged "full absurdity of this phrase,"—to-wit, *is being built*,—"the essence of its nonsense," vanishes, thus, into thin air.[4] So I was about to comment

---

[1] So, in German, both *sein* and an outgrowth of the obsolete *wesen* are required to the same end. *Ich bin gewesen* is the counterpart of *io sono stato*.

[2] Agglutinations I purposely pass by, as belonging to the region of speculation. The classical scholar will not need to be reminded, that, in *fueram*, *fuero*, &c., the verbs *fuere* and *esse* are supposed, by some, to be welded together.

[3] As Landor notices,—in his *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 72,—Milton, more than once, Italianizes his verbs, and imitates *stavano pregando*, where he writes, at the beginning of the Eleventh Book of *The Paradise Lost*:

> "Thus they, in lowliest plight, repentant *stood*
> *Praying*."

Just before, Adam and Eve "prostrate fell"; and we have no intimation that they had risen to their feet.

[4] Reference to the present Appendix, as, in essentially its present shape, it first appeared, is made in the following passages.

"I have twice gone attentively through Dr. Hall's article, ... and I did so with the purpose, I might also say the hope, of finding occasion for the modification of my judgment. I found, on the contrary, not a single point brought up which I had not carefully considered before, as could be shown, if the chapter and the article were printed side by side. Dr. Hall reaches one conclusion; I, another. I venture to say, that this is possible, without my being arrogant or unwise. It is not the first case, in the annals of literature, in which arguments thought to be overwhelming by those on whose side they were used, were regarded as not at all so by those against whom they were directed." Mr. R. G. White, Letter in *The Nation*, March 13, 1873.

"As there is not a view that he [Dr. Hall] presents, which I had not previously considered and rejected in my chapter on the subject, any mention of his article would have been, at least, superfluous. *The Nation* decides that my assailant (not my 'antagonist,' if you please) is right throughout," &c. *Ibid.*, Letter in *The New York Times*, June 7, 1873.

bluntly, not forgetting to regret, that any gentleman's cultivation of logic should fructify in the shape

---

As I have pointed out in a previous foot-note, Mr. White has thought certain facts of history, bearing on *is being built*, &c., well worth helping himself to from my pages; and he has helped himself to them in perfect quiet. Would mention of his obligation to me therefor also have come under the head of the "superfluous"?

However wide may be the prevalence of anything in the way of language, Mr. White's great principle is, that you can say very little for it, unless you can justify it by reason. Fancying himself within the charmed circle of science, he misanalysed *is being built* into *is being + built;* and, on the implied ground of its being only thus analysable, and to the effect of yielding an absurd element, *is being*, he passed sentence on it, as unendurable. I, for my part, formally analysed the expression, and analogically, into *is + being built;* and it has not been shown that I was not original in this my formal analysis, at least as regards setting it forth in print. If Mr. White knew of this analysis before he read my paper, why did not he upset it; the upsetting of it being indispensable to the setting up of his own analysis? And, now that he knows of my analysis, why does not he expose its sophisticalness, if it be sophistical? Does he really take in my argument? As *The Nation* puts it, "if Mr. White cannot see the point, his perspicacity is not to be envied." Further, if he cannot, what is his aptitude for philology?

Charged with having buried my "adverse arguments under the profoundest silence," he replies, as we have seen, that he had anticipatively considered and rejected every view that I present, and, addressing my friendly reviewer, asserts, that he has "the right to protest against your unmistakable implication, that I shrink from argument, under the cover of a cowardly silence." Vague assertions and a bold front are not refutation; and, as to the first, if he can circumstantiate, to his advantage, those which he has ventured, why does he hesitate to do so?

To bring out clearly Mr. White's utter impracticability as a philologist, I subjoin extracts from his two Prefaces, with a few words of comment thereon.

"To assault any position of mine, which is not, itself, taken upon the ground of usage, by bringing up the 'authority,' that is, the mere example, of eminent writers, is at once to beg the question at issue."

In other words, whether, as regards any given expression, the concurrent practice of eminent writers is extensive enough, or sufficiently grounded in reason, to constitute usage, is a matter of which Mr.

of irrepressible tendencies to suicide. But this would be precipitate. Agreeably to one of Mr. White's judicial placita, which I make no apology for citing twice, "no man who has preserved all his senses will doubt, for a moment, that 'to *exist* a mastiff or a mule' is absolutely the same as 'to *be* a mastiff or a mule.'" Declining to admit their identity, I have not preserved all my senses; and, accordingly,—though it may be, in me, the very superfetation of lunacy,—I would caution the reader to keep a sharp eye on my arguments, hereabouts particularly. The Cretan who, by declaring all Cretans to be liars, left the question of his veracity doubtful to all eternity, fell into a pit of his own digging. Not unlike the unfortunate Cretan, Mr. White has tumbled headlong into his own snare. It was, for the rest, entirely unavailing, that he insisted on the insanity of those who should gainsay his fundamental postulate.[1]

White alone is to be judge. He may take his stand on what he considers to be usage; but, if others, without his permission, presume to take their stand on what they consider to be usage, they at once "beg the question at issue." A hard saying, this, for all who are not willing to accept Mr. White as absolute philological dictator.

Again: "The points from which I have regarded words are, in general, rather those of taste and reason than of history; and my discussions are philological, only as all study of words must be philological."

But, as concerns words, how, without historical knowledge, acquaintance with usage, is one to ascertain their conformity, or inconformity, to taste? Intuition guides us in our preference as between strawberries and coloquintida; but it would never teach us not to call a *person* a *party*. As to reason, Mr. White's endowment of it has led him to denounce *militate* as "absurd", and to similar conclusions by dozens. Of his closing clause the darkness is well nigh impenetrable. Unless he thereby assumes the privilege of philologizing without incurring a philologist's responsibilities, his drift has eluded me.

[1] Mr. White is rather addicted, in a metaphorical way, to hovering

Sanity, of a crude sort, may accept it; and sanity may put it to a use other than its propounder's.

Mr. Marsh, after setting forth the all-sufficiency of *is building*, in the passive sense,[1] goes on to say: "The reformers who object to the phrase I am defending must, in consistency, employ the proposed substitute with all passive participles, and in other tenses as well as the present. They must say, therefore: 'The subscription-paper *is being missed*, but I know that a considerable sum *is being wanted* to make up the amount;' 'the great Victoria Bridge *has been being built* more than two years;' 'when I reach London, the ship Leviathan *will be being built;*' 'if my orders had been followed, the coat *would have been being made yesterday;*' 'if the house *had* then *been being built*, the mortar *would have been being mixed.*'"[2]

about the melancholy precincts of the mad. "To this day we say, every man and boy of us who is not fitter for Bedlam than many who are sent there, 'There *is* a storm *a-brewing*', as our forefathers have said for centuries."

Besides, what point is there in this? *Brew* is not exclusively a verb active, any more than *gather*, as where we say 'the clouds *are gathering*.'

[1] The dead Polonius was, in Hamlet's phrase, at supper, "not where he *eats*, but where he *is eaten*"; and Mr. White takes *is eaten* to be, here, a present imperfect. As such, it would be ambiguous; and yet Mr. White commends Shakespeare for it, though *is in eating* would have been not only correct in his day, but, where it would have come in his sentence, univocal. With equal reason, a man would be entitled to commendation for tearing his mutton-chops with his fingers, when he might cut them up with a knife and fork. "*Is eaten*," says Mr. White, "does not mean *has been eaten*." Very true; but what it does mean, he, though an editor of Shakespeare, is very far from seeing. The *eats* and *is eaten* in question are aoristic; and the character of an aorist is to abstract from any definite time, past, present, or future. The King of Denmark's lord chamberlain had no precedent in Herod, when "he *was eaten* of worms;" the original, γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος, yielding, but for its participle, 'he became worm-eaten.'

[2] *Lectures*, &c., p. 654. Professor Fowler argues in the same way.

There was a time when, as to their adverbs, people compared them, to a large extent, with *-er* and *-est*, or with *more* and *most*, just as their ear or pleasure dictated. They wrote *plainlier* and *plainliest*, or *more plainly* and *most plainly*;[1] and some adverbs, as *early*, *late*, *often*, *seldom*, and *soon*, we still compare in a way now become anomalous. And, as our forefathers treated their adverbs, we still treat many adjectives. Furthermore, *obligingness*, *preparedness*, and *designedly* seem quite natural; yet we do not feel that they authorize us to talk of 'the *seeingness* of the eye,' 'the *understoodness* of a sentence,' or of 'a statement *acknowledgedly* correct.' *The now too notorious fact* is tolerable; but *the never to be sufficiently execrated monster Buonaparte* is intolerable. The sun may be *shorn* of his splendour; but we do not allow cloudy weather to *shear* him of it. How, then, can any one claim, that a man who prefers to say *is being built*, should say *has been being built?* While awkward instances of the old form are most abundant in our literature, there is no fear that the repulsive elaborations which have been worked out in ridicule of the new form[2]

"Expressions like the following have, for some years, been stealing into the language: 'While the house *was being burned*', instead of 'while the house *was burning*'; 'while the battle *was being fought*" instead of 'while the battle *was fought*'. Some expressions like these are awkward, and difficult to be dealt with. Is it not better to say 'He will find the house *will be building*', than to say 'He will find the house *will be being built*'? Is it not better to say 'I knew the house *to be building*', than to say 'I knew the house *to be being built*'?" *English Grammar* (ed. 1855), p. 605.

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 188.

[2] Mr. White, with his usual infelicity in drawing conclusions, writes as follows: "If precise affectation can impose upon us such a phrase as *is being done*, for *is doing*, it must needs drive all idioms kindred

will prove to have been anticipations of future usage. "The reformers" have not forsworn their ears. Mr. Marsh, at p. 135 of his admirable *Lectures*, lays down, that "the adjective *reliable*, in the sense of *worthy of confidence*, is altogether unidiomatic;" and yet, at p. 112, he writes "*reliable* evidence." Again, at p. 396 of the same work, he rules, that "we should scruple to say 'I passed a house *whose* windows were open';" and, at p. 145 of his very learned *Man and Nature*, he writes of "a quadrangular pyramid, the perpendicular of *whose* sides," &c. Really, if his own judgments sit so very loose on his practical conscience, we may, without being chargeable with exaction, ask of him to remit a little the rigour of his requirements at the hands of his neighbours.

Beckford's Lisbon fortune-teller, before had into court, was "*dragging* into light," and, perchance, "*was taking* to account." Many moderns would say and write '*being dragged* into light' and '*was being taken* to account.' But, if we are to trust the conservative critics, in comparison with expressions of

---

to the latter from the language. Our *walking sticks*, our *fishing rods*, and our *fasting days*, because they cannot *walk*, or *fish*, or *fast*, must be changed into *to-be-walked-with sticks*, *to-be-fished-with rods*, and *to-be-fasted-on days*; and our *church-going bells* must become *for-to-church-go bells*, because *they* are not the belles that go to church. Such ruin comes of laying presumptuous hands upon idioms, those sacred mysteries of language."

The true character of the terms *walking-stick*, *fishing-rod*, &c., is here misunderstood. The first member of each of these compounds is static, and, consequently, no longer a participle. Moreover, if Mr. White's principles were correctly applied, *walking-stick*, for instance, would demand resolution into *stick-that-is-being-walked-with*. See my remarks on *churchgoing-bell*, &c., in *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*, p. 4, text and note 2.

the former pattern, those of the latter are "uncouth," "clumsy," "awkward neologisms," "philological coxcombries," "formal and pedantic," "incongruous and ridiculous forms of speech," "illogical, confusing, inaccurate monstrosities." Moreover, they are neither "consistent with reason" nor "conformed to the normal development of the language;" they are "at war with the genius of the English tongue;" they are "unidiomatic;" they are "not English." In passing, if Mr. Marsh will so define the term *unidiomatic*, as to evince that it has any applicability to the case in hand, or if he will arrest and photograph "the genius of the English tongue," so that we may know the original, when we meet with it, he will confer a public favour. And now I submit for consideration, whether the sole credit of those who decry *is being built* and its congeners, does not consist in their talent for calling hard names. If they have not an uneasy subconsciousness that their cause is weak, they would, at least, do well in eschewing the violence to which, for want of something better, the advocates of weak causes proverbially resort.

I once had a friend who, for some microscopic penumbra of heresy, was charged, in the words of his accuser, with "as near an approach to the sin against the Holy Ghost as is practicable to human infirmity." Similarly, on one view, the feeble potencies of philological turpitude seem to have exhibited their most consummate realization, in engendering *is being built*. The supposed enormity perpetrated in its production, provided it had fallen within the sphere of ethics,

would, at the least, have ranked, with its denunciators, as a brand-new exemplification of total depravity. But, after all, what incontestable defect in it has any one succeeded in demonstrating? Mr. White, in opposing to the expression objections based on an erroneous analysis, simply lays a phantom of his own evoking;[1] and, so far as I am informed, other impugners of *is being built* have, absolutely, no argument whatever against it, over and beyond their repugnance to novelty. Subjected to a little untroubled contemplation, it would, I am confident, have ceased, long ago, to be matter of controversy. But the dust of prejudice and passion, which so distempers the intellectual vision of theologians and politicians, is seen to make, with ruthless impartiality, no exception of the perspicacity of philologists.

Prior to the evolution of *is being built* and *was being built*, we possessed no discriminate equivalents of *ædificatur* and *ædificabatur*; *is built* and *was built*, by which they were rendered, corresponding exactly to *ædificatus est* and *ædificatus erat*. *Ædificaretur*—after *cum*,—was, to us, the same as *ædificabatur*. On the wealth of the Greek in expressions of imperfect

[1] So much for the career of Mr. White, with his black flag and no quarter. In appearing as an essayist on the niceties of language, he has wandered from his congenial element, which, whatever it may be, is not criticism; and the self-confident imperiousness and the impetuous disdain which too often disfigure his pages, are all the more provocative of raillery, from being associated, at every turn, with tokens of haste, caprice, and imperfect information. Of that equanimity, circumspection, patience of research, intellectual discipline, and equipment of micrological scholarship, without which it is given to no man to be a philologist, he has, unhappily, made the most penurious *provision*.

passion I need not dwell. With rare exceptions, the Romans were satisfied with the present imperfect and the past imperfect; and we, on the comparatively few occasions which present themselves for expressing other imperfects, shall be sure to have recourse to the old forms, rather than to the new, or else to use periphrases.[1] The purists may, accordingly, dismiss their apprehensions, especially as the neoterists have, clearly, a keener horror of phraseological ungainliness than themselves. One may have no hesitation about saying 'the house *is being built*,' and yet may recoil from saying that 'it *should have been being built* last Christmas;' and the same person—just as, provided he did not feel a harshness, inadequacy, and ambiguity, in the passive 'the house *is building*,' he would use the expression,—will, more likely than not, elect *is in preparation*, preferentially to *is being prepared*. If there be any who, in their zealotry for the congruous, choose to adhere to the new form, in its entire range of exchangeability for the old, let it be hoped that they will find, in Mr.

[1] "But those things which, *being* not now *doing*, or having not yet been done, have a natural aptitude to exist hereafter, may be properly said to appertain to the future." James Harris, *Hermes*, Book 1, Ch. 8 (p. 155, foot-note, ed. 1771). For Harris's "*being* not now *doing*," which is to translate *μὴ γινόμενα*, the modern school, if they pursued uniformity with more of fidelity than of taste, would have to put '*being* not now *being done*.' There is not much to choose between the two.

"And a book was then said to be printed, though I never saw any but one of late with any date of the year; the things then *being in fieri*, when it was printed." Dr. Horneck, in *Sadducismus Triumphatus* (ed. 1726), p. 363.

Dr. Horneck resorts to the Latin, where Harris, more boldly, writes "being doing."

Compare with Harris's expression the expressions quoted in note 1 to p. 336, *supra*.

Marsh's speculative approbation of consistency, full amends for the discomfort of encountering smiles or frowns.

The ambiguousness of the old neuter possessive *his*[1] was not, even by very long prescription, indefeasibly sanctified to our practical forefathers. With the *him* of *himself*[2] for a precedent,—if they thought of it as such, and if, in improving our language, they governed themselves, except unconsciously, by precedents,—they first tried, in place of this *his*, *it*,[3]

[1] In *Exodus*, 27, 2 and 3, *his* refers to "altar"; in the *Psalms*, 54, 7, to "eye"; in *St. Matthew*, 6, 33, to "kingdom"; in *Acts*, 12, 10, to "gate"; and in 1 *Cor.*, 15, 38, to "seed". In some of these passages, the Geneva version has *it*.

His is the Anglo-Saxon possessive of both *he* and *hit* (our *it*).

[2] *His self* was used in the Elizabethan period, and earlier. See Bishop Bale, *A Brefe Chronycle*, &c. (1544), in *Select Works* (1849), p. 39: *Kynge Johan* (ed. 1838), p. 98. *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings* (1594), fol. 31 r. The vulgar use it still. *Themselves*, of old, like *himself*, had its rivals, and as regarded both its elements.

Them self. Lydgate, *Minor Poems* (ed. 1840), p. 108. Simon Fish (*circ.* 1529), *Four Supplications* (ed. 1871), p. 10. Sir Thomas More, *Apologye* (1533), fol. 7, 55. Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Governour* (1531), fol. 85 (ed. 1580).

Them selfs. Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), fol. 105, 306. Also see Raphe Robynson, as quoted *supra*, p. 332, note 2.

Their self. Ascham, *Toxophilus* (1545), pp. 44, 69, 101 (ed. 1868).

Their selves. *Id.*, *The Scholemaster* (1570), p. 97 (ed. 1870).

[3] The Anglo-Saxon form *hit* is found, interchangeably with *it*, as nominative, &c., in Lydgate, Sir Thomas More, Sir Thomas Elyot, and writers of their times. Shortly before, only *hit* occurs; shortly after, only *it*.

In the central parts of North Carolina, it appears, *it* is even now pronounced *hit*. See a letter by Mr. Fisk P. Brewer, in *The Nation*, Feb. 27, 1873.

Him is, in one passage, used, by Ascham, for *it*. "But take hede that youre bowe stande not to nere a stone wall; for that wyll make *hym* moyste and weke; nor yet to nere any fier; for that wyll make *him* shorte and brittle." *Toxophilus* (1545), p. 119 (ed. 1868).

neuter as to gender, and objective as to case, and wrote "of *it* own accord".[1] Time rolled on, and, in its fulness, emerged the scholastic opprobrium of his age, the inventor of *its*.[2] For what can be said in

---

Hit, as a possessive,—see Dr. Morris's *Early English Alliterative Poems* (ed. 1864), p. 46, l. 264, and p. 66, l. 956,—was in provincial use at least from about 1360. Also see *The Anturs of Arther*, &c., in *Three Early English Metrical Romances* (1842), p. 5, ll. 2, 3.

[1] This, or, rather, "of *it* owne accord", is the true reading of *Leviticus*, 25, 5.

Did *it*, for 'its', survive the Restoration? It was not quite obsolete just before.

"If merit be all-sufficient to entitle *it* possessor to preferment, what merit greater then what is resident in persons in holy orders?" Hamon L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (ed. 1656), p. 37.

[2] The earliest instance of *its* that I know to have been pointed out, occurs in Florio, *A Worlde of Wordes* (1598).

Shakespeare, it has been shown, has, by the Folio of 1623, *its* ten times, and *it*, in the same sense, fifteen times. See *The Bible Word-book*, by Messrs. J. Eastwood and W. Aldis Wright, pp. 273—275.

"Ben Jonson neither employs *its* in his works, nor recognizes it in his *Grammar*." Mr. Marsh, *Lectures*, &c., p. 399.

This statement is partly erroneous. As Dr. Abbott has observed, Ben Jonson employs *its* in *The Silent Woman*, Act 2, Scene 3. See *A Shakespearian Grammar* (ed. 1871), p. 151.

Some old writers, before the introduction of *its*, denoted an insentient object by *he* and *him*, especially when there was occasion to refer to it by the neuter possessive, then *his*. And the relative of such a *he* or *him* was *who*. Puttenham is rather fond of this style of construction.

"The sharpe accent falles upon the penultima, or last save one sillable of the verse, which doth so drowne the last, as *he* seemeth to passe away in maner unpronounced." *The Arte of English Poesie*, p. 59.

"A staffe of sixe verses is very pleasant to the eare, and also serveth for a greater complement then the inferiour staves, which maketh *him* more commonly to be used." *Id.*, p. 55.

"Both verses be of egall quantitie, vidz., seaven sillables a peece; and yet the first seemes shorter then the later, *who* shewes a more odnesse then the former, by reason of *his* sharpe accent," &c. *Id.*, p. 59.

Similar illustrations might be given from Ascham and many other Elizabethan authors. See note 3 in the preceding page.

Whom, in old times, was often used for *which*. See Bishop Bale,

defence of this verbal Yahoo? As has, again and again, been pointed out, it would have a precise parallel in the Latin portent *illudius*, where one case-ending is adjoined to another, instead of displacing it. The word, viewed scientifically, is monstrous, certainly; and yet, as it was needed, it eventually came to be accepted by everybody, though not without a weary struggle;[1] even as it took several

---

Select Works (1849), pp. 140, 147, &c.; also, my *Recent Exemplifications*, &c., p. 7, note 1, *ad finem*.

[1] Among the early writers who employ *its* with peculiar frequency, Mabbe is noticeable. In *The Rogue*, which he published in 1623, it is found, I should say, several score times.

To the philologist *The Rogue* is of great value. The high encomium passed, by Ben Jonson, on this translation, its language included, is well deserved. This encomium, which has escaped Jonson's editors, is here transcribed.

"On the Author, Worke, and Translator.

"Who tracks this authors, or translators, pen,
Shall finde that either hath read bookes and men:
To say but one were single. Then it chimes,
When the old words doe strike on the new times,
As in this Spanish Proteus; who, though writ
But in one tongue, was form'd with the worlds wit;
And hath the noblest marke of a good booke,
That an ill man dares not securely looke
Upon it, but will loath, or let it passe,
As a deformed face doth a true glasse.
Such bookes deserve translators of like coate
As was the genius wherewith they were wrote:
And this hath met that one that may be stil'd
More then the foster-father of this child.
For, though Spaine gave him his first ayre and vogue,
He would be call'd, henceforth, *The English Rogue*,
But that hee 's too well suted, in a cloth
Finer then was his Spanish, if my oath
Will be receiv'd in court: if not, would I
Had cloath'd him so. Here 's all I can supply
To your desert, who have done it, friend. And this
Faire æmulation, and no envy, is,

generations to get rid of phrases like 'the *man his* name'.[1] And, as were the final fortunes of *its*, so,

---

When you behold me wish my selfe the man
That would have done that which you onely can.
BEN JONSON."

[1] In England, to this day, the vulgar write, in their Bibles, Prayer-books, and elsewhere, "John *Crane his* book", "Esther *Hodges her* book", &c.

"*Abram his* name", and "*Sarai her* name". *Genesis*, 17, heading. "*Artaxerxes his* letters". 1 *Esdras*, 2, 30. "*Darius his* pillow". *Ibid.*, 3, 8. "*Olofernes his* heart". *Judith*, 12, 16. "*Olofernes his* head". *Ibid.*, 13, 9. And other such expressions might be quoted from the Bible.

In *Ruth*, 3, heading, there is a modern sophistication of "*Naomi her* instruction", and of "*Boaz his* feete"; in 1 *Kings*, 15, 14, of "*Asa his* heart"; and, in *Esther*, 3, 4, of "*Mordecai his* matters." I here give the readings of the edition of 1611.

"*Socrates his* disciples", "*Xenophon his* house", "every *bodye his* hande." Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c., fol. 21, 32, 149. "*Aristotle his* judgement." Ascham, *Toxophilus*, p. 46. But, at p. 56, we have "*Chaucers* verses." And Ascham puts *his* after the plural. "Other *men his* lippes." *Ibid.*, p. 30. "Plato and Aristotle *his* brayne." *Ibid.*, p. 41. At p. 44, in "more like *Robin Hoode* servaunt than *Apollose*", we find both the absence of inflexion and a modification of the present use.

Like Ascham's "other *men his* lippes" is "Here gynneth a dyté of *women his hornys*," the heading which Lydgate gives to his ballad on the forked head-dresses of ladies. See his *Minor Poems*, p. 46.

As in "*Robin Hoode* servaunt", the equivalent of *'s* was once freely forgone, where the addition of it would have produced cacophony. "*Pindarus* sand", "*Hercules* race", "*Miltiades* example", "*Lycurgus* lawes", "*Cyrillus* sonne", "*Cyrus* campe". *The French Academie*, Part I. (ed. 1589), pp. 162, 167, 192, 203, 490. "*Olofernes* head". *Judith*, 13, 6. We have, in these phrases, the retention of a very old usage. See Mr. Marsh, *Lectures*, &c., pp. 397—401.

"But such answers are no testimony of the fact, but helps for the searching out of truth; so that, whether the *party tortured his* answer be true or false, or whether he answer not at all, whatsoever he doth, he doth it by right." Hobbes, *Works* (ed. Sir W. Molesworth), Vol. 2, p. 26.

This I have quoted for its extreme awkwardness.

"*Asa his* heart", and the like, even long after *his*, so constructed, passed for a pronoun, was generally accepted. But, as the pro-

there is not much hazard in forecasting, will be those of locutions like *is being done* and *was being built.*

---

noun *his* seemed absurd, unless referring to a male, and to one male only, *her* and, to a certain extent, *their* came in.

Instances of *her* I have given from the Bible, in its incorrupt form. I add an instance of later date, and several instances of earlier date.

"They continued all along Queen *Elizabeth her* reign." Hamon L'Estrange, *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (1659), p. 304.

"Wee doo not omytte *Elizabeth Holland her* howse, newlie made in Suffolk." *State Papers*, &c., Vol. 1 (1830), p. 889. This passage dates in 1546.

"In this his absence, one Curio, a gentleman of Naples, of little wealth and lesse wit, haunted *Lucilla hir* company," &c. Lyly, *Euphues* (1579-80), p. 94 (ed. 1868).

"O had I not ben better abyd *Amarillis her* anger?"

Webbe, *A Discourse of English Poetrie* (1586), in *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 76.

"Had I thought your maistership would have taken my free speeches in so ill part, which concerned onely my selfe and my ready abilitie to forward, to my power, my *Prince her* occasions and services, I would have forborne to have uttered my minde, wherein I onely grieved that any should exempt themselves, or forbeare to extend their uttermost helpe and indevour in such good workes." *Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings*, &c. (1594), fol. 8 v.

Queen Elizabeth is here alluded to, and in a way, apparently making her epicene, which now seems ludicrous.

"A little wasted cates stood us instead of *Lucullus and Appicius their* most sumptuous banquets." *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Book 3, p. 73.

"*Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius their* unbridled lusts." Henry Earl of Monmouth, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (ed. 1656), p. 354.

Gabriell Harvey, writing to Spenser, in 1580, speaks of "absurdities" which "yl-favoured orthographye, or, rather, pseudography, hathe ingendred"; and he goes on to instance, with "*sithence*, for *since*", "*phantasie*, for *phansie*", &c. &c., "'*God hys* wrath', for '*Goddes* wrath', ... wherein the corrupte orthography, in the moste, hathe beene the sole, or principall, cause of corrupte prosodye in overmany." *Ancient Critical Essays*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 281.

Charles Butler, one of our early grammarians, writes, under the date of 1634: "The Teutonik termination of the genitive some refined wit hath turned to *his*, perswading himself that *s* is but a corrupt abbreviation of *his*, which hee thought necessary to restore; and, therefore, hee wil not write 'my *masters son* is a child', but 'my

Their history, short as it is, evinces that they were wanted; as legitimate developments, they are un-

---

master his son is a child'; which is just as good as if, in Latin, hee would say, not *heri filius*, but *herus ejus filius, est infans.*"

Ben Jonson, in his *Grammar*, — first printed in 1640, after his death,—speaks of "the monstrous syntax of the pronoun *his* joining with a noun, betokening a possessor; as 'the *prince his* house', for 'the *prince's* house'." Jonson, however, published, in 1605,—as I see by the original edition, now lying before me,—his drama entitled "*Sejanus his* Fall", in the preface to which he speaks of "my observations upon *Horace his* 'Art of Poetry'": and he has like expressions elsewhere.

And this "monstrous syntax", consciously as such, is found in books by the most learned authors, for the space of near two centuries. Even Addison practised it; as in *The Spectator*, Nos. 171, 183, 409. Not long after his time, however,—though it was not scorned by Warburton and Sterne,—it fast fell into disrepute. When Horace Walpole, in 1767, wrote "King Edward the *Fourth his* death", doubtless his contemporaries looked on him as rather quaint, to say the least. See *Historic Doubts*, &c. (ed. 1768), pp. 66, 67.

"The same single letter *s* on many occasions does the office of a whole word, and represents the *his* and *her* of our forefathers." Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 135. This is carelessly worded; but Bishop Lowth's comment on it is hardly fair. In one sense, *s* "represents", certainly, the *his* and *her* of those among "our forefathers" whose language, alone, Addison seems to have been conversant with. Further, though Addison omitted to mention, still he no doubt knew, that "our forefathers" who wrote, for instance, *king his* and *queen her*, wrote *kinges* and *queenes*, also. No less uncritical than Addison is the Bishop himself, in saying: "'*Christ his* sake', in our liturgy, is a mistake, either of the printers or of the compilers." How "a mistake", when nobody hesitated at such an expression? And do not manuscripts abundantly prove that expressions of this sort need not be set to the account of old printers?

Where we write *'s*, to mark the possessive singular, there was, anciently, in some masculine and neuter substantives, the syllable *-es*, often corrupted into *-ys*, *-is*, &c.; as *landes*, *landys*, or *landis*, for *land's*. Words like *man's*, succeeding *mannes*, &c., arose sooner than words like *church's*, for which we find, much later, *churches*. In *prince's*, and the like, equally with *princes*,—in the first of which, the apostrophe only precludes confusion with the plural,—we are obliged to make the possessive termination a distinct syllable; but, in old times, the possessives *kinges*, *nightes*, &c., also, were dissyllables.

impeachable; and their most inveterate assailants must admit, however reluctantly, that, even among

---

"And to the God of love thus seyd he,
With pitous voys: 'O Lord, now *youris* is
The spiryt which that ought ever *youris* be."
Chaucer, *Poetical Works* (ed. 1855), Vol. 5, p. 33.

In like manner, *theiris*, &c., were, of yore, two syllables.

For several centuries, the rights of *h* were far from being rigidly defined; and old authors often have *hable*, *habundance*, *hangle*, *happle*, *hearl*, *helder*, *hoak*, *howlet*, *husance*, &c., with *abit*, *emisphere*, *emorrhoids*, *ierarch*, *oly*, *ymn*, *ypocrite*, *yssop*, &c. In the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, as I could show from Roberd of Gloucester, William of Palerne, Capgrave, and a host of other authorities, *his*, the pronoun, was corrupted into *is*. I shall make use, a little further on, of the fact here shown, namely, that the initial *h* was once prefixed, or omitted, with great carelessness.

"He was afered he was to slowe;
He rose up he wyst not howe,
And brake out at a wyndow,
And brake fowle *ys* heed."
Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, p. 113.

"The pryst toke a by pathe; wyth them he wolde not mett;
Yit *ys* hed was fowle brokyn; the blod ran dowen to *ys* fett."
Id., *ibid.*, p. 114.

"Whilom the thridde hevenes lorde above,
As wel by hevenysh revolucioun,
As by desert, hath wonne *Venus his* love."
Chaucer, Vol. 8, p. 30.

"The Kinges Highnesse doith perceyve that the Queene is thoonly cawse of this mannys goyng into Spaigne, as he that is, and hath bene allways, prive unto the *Quene his* affaires and secretes." Secretary William Knighte (1527), *State Papers*, &c., Vol. 1 (1830), p. 215.

"And, where ye write to me that the *Quene is* good favour must be alewred with geving hir one other moneth wagis for 200 men", &c. Duke of Norfolk (1524), *State Papers*, &c., Vol. 4 (1836), p. 225.

As, in the same page with this passage, the Duke of Norfolk uses the possessives *Quenes* and *Kingis*, it is plain, that, in his "*Quene is*",—with which compare "the *moone is* light", in *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript* (1867-8), Vol. 1, p. 161, l. 548,—we have simply a resolution of *Quenes*, and not a corruption of the pronoun *his*, applied anomalously; and, manifestly, Chaucer's *his*, in "*Venus his*",

our best writers, the current is setting, day by day, more and more strongly in their favour.

---

and Knighte's, in "*Quene his*", exhibit no such corruption. Neither, where, as quoted at p. 355, *supra*, Lydgate has "*women his* hornys", and Ascham has "*men his* lippes", can we readily suppose that they intended *his* for *their*, but simply for a sign of the possessive case.

This *his*, then, I incline to consider as having been, originally, depraved from *-is*, the possessive case-ending, taken as a substantive word. At first it came by its *h* through carelessness, perhaps, or, much less probably, from a wish to prevent its being mistaken for the verb *is*. That it was not, until a comparatively late period, identified with the pronoun *his*, seems evident from the earliest date of such expressions as 'the *woman her* child', 'the *dog and cat their* food'. If the *h* of *his* for *-is*, &c., began with being silent, the word did not, so far as the ear was concerned, suggest the pronoun *his*, as, presumably, ordinarily pronounced. It may have been its visible identity therewith that led, at last, to its being confounded with it. This confusion, however produced, naturally gave rise, when it had taken root, to the analogous uses of *her* and *their*, as in 'the *woman her*', a style of phraseology which I have noticed no instance of earlier than the sixteenth century.

The theory here set forth I worked out, in its entirety, many years ago. Taken as a whole, I do not know that it has been forestalled.

ADDITIONS.

P. 8. With the remarks there quoted from Dr. Bentley, the following, also by him, ill harmonize.

"Every living language, like the perspiring bodies of living creatures, is in perpetual motion and alteration. Some words go off, and become obsolete; others are taken in, and, by degrees, grow into common use; or the same word is inverted to a new sense and notion, which, in tract of time, makes as observable a change in the air and feature of a language, as age makes in the lines and mien of a face." *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 1.

P. 8, note 1. In Book 3, p. 63, of *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), a translation, parallels of what are called "Dugardismes" are offered in "*com*, *hav*, &c., without *e*, and *detor*, *dout*, without *b*."

Richard Hodges, in *The Plainest Directions*, &c. (1649), p. 40, among "som special observations, very needful to bee known, for the help of true writing," gives, as the first: "Take heed, that you never put a double consonant with an *e* in the end of any word; for there is no necessitie thereof. And the rather wee may bee bold so to do, becaus the learned, both in printing and writing, do daily practise it." Exceptions are admitted; and one of the earliest is the proper name *Anne*. Hodges goes on to prescribe *al* (*all*), *cal* (*call*), *lodg*, *judg*, *lac* (*lack*), *nek* (*neck*), *medle* (*meddle*), *fidle* (*fiddle*), *feebl*, *steepl*, *giv*, *liv*, *hous*, *mous*, &c. &c.

P. 45, l. 20. *Sepulture*, in the sense of 'sepulchre', or 'burial-place', is used repeatedly by Lydgate. See his *Minor Poems* (ed. 1840), pp. 60, 142, 148, 236.

P. 58, note 2. Instances like the following are not uncommon in our older literature:

"He rose hym up, and priveliche he *is went*
Into hys chambre."
Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, p. 64.

"Duryng my lyf, with many gret trespace,
By many wrong path wher I *have myswent*," &c.
Id., *ibid.*, p. 241.

P. 59, note 1. *Gilt*, for *gild*. Sir Thomas More, *A Dyaloge* (ed. 1529), fol. 8, 13. *Quaft*, for *quaff*. *Of the Olde God and the Newe*, &c. (ed. 1534), sig. O.

Dr. Richardson's genealogy of the verb *rent* from *rend*, through "rended, rend'd", is not very plausible.

Many of our verbs, obsolete and current, end in a *d* for which there is no etymological justification. Such a one is *round*, for 'whisper', the preterite of which had come, however, in 1649, to be identical, to the ear, with the infinitive. See Richard Hodges, *The Plainest Directions*, &c., p. 18. *Punne*, which preceded our *pound*, occurs as late as 1589. See Thomas Coghan, *The Haven of Health*, Ch. 1, 111. Udall, in his *Apophthegmes*, &c., has *compoune*, *expoune*, *propoune*, *soune*, for *compound*, &c., which have no more respectable origin than the vulgar *drownd* and *gownd*.

The freedom with which a superfluous *d* once was tacked to certain verbs, is illustrated by the two following extracts.

"By so dooyng, the bruite of that same his high praise and commendacion was not to be hidden or *pended* within the limites & precintes of grece." Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), fol. 217 v.

"If thou, oh sillie booke, doe chaunce
To light into the hand
Of any such as takes delight
Ech others worke to *scand*," &c.
John Norden, *A Sinfull Mans Solace* (1585), fol. 161 v.

In the work last quoted, there occurs, in fol. 88 v., *bestraughted*, which resembles Fuller's *unshakened*.

"Thou *wentedst*," in Robert Southwell's *A Hundred Meditations*, &c. (ed. 1873), p. 152, I take to be an error of the press.

P. 63, foot. Older than the passage from William Watson are the following extracts.

"Such are they which, having godly wisdom, uttereth it according to the *talent* given them of the Lord," &c. Bishop Bale, *Select Works* (1849), p. 608.

"For there is a God in heaven, that will, one day, aske accompt what *talent* he gave thee in his absence to use," &c. John Norden, *A Sinfull Mans Solace* (1585), fol. 16 v.

P. 79, foot. For *wert*, instead of *wast*, other references to old authors here follow. Bishop Bale, *Kynge Johan* (ed. 1838), p. 71: *Select Works* (1849), pp. 308, 309. John Norden, *A Sinfull Mans Solace* (1585), fol. 67 r. Robert Southwell (before 1595), *Prose Works* (ed. 1828), pp. 16, 21, 22, 28, 63, 70, 74, 77: *A Hundred Meditations*, &c. (ed. 1873), pp. 9, 52, 57, 69, 70, 76, &c. &c. Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, *Patient Grissil* (1603), p. 37 (ed. 1841).

Werest, for *wert*, occurs in the Geneva Bible, as in *Revelation*, 3, 15.

The authorized version has, there and elsewhere, *wert*. And so has Bishop Bale, *Select Works*, p. 292.

For 'thou *were*', indicative, see Udall, *Apophthegmes* (1542), fol. 18: John Norden, *A Sinfull Mans Solace*, fol. 28 r, 81 r, 90 v.

P. 80, l. 2. Connected with the references thereto appended, a personal matter has arisen, of which it seems expedient that I should take some notice.

Inquiry having been made as to the age of the expression 'different *to*', I sent to *The Nation* a letter on the subject, which was published Sept. 5, 1872. I gave numerous quotations for the phrase; and among them were three under the dates of 1635 and 1668, as I took pains to particularize.

In *The Nation* of Sept. 19, 1872, is a letter from Mr. Richard Grant White. Therein we read: "Mr. Hall has shown that the phrase was used about a hundred and fifty years ago." I had, it is true, pointed out that Steele uses it in *The Guardian;* but, as I state above, I had traced it back much further. Mr. White also writes:

"Let me add to Mr. Hall's examples, for use in his forthcoming book, which cannot fail to be an interesting one, the following singular use, by a distinguished dramatist of the beginning of the last century, of 'different *from*' and 'different *to*', in two 'contagious' lines.

"'*Aurelia.* Sir, you appear very different to me *from* what you were lately.'

"'*Truelove.* Madam, you appear very indifferent to me *to* what you were lately.' Farquhar's *Twin Rivals*, iii., 3, p. 42, ed. 1703.

"It may have been by mere chance; but Farquhar made the lady say *from*, and the gentleman, *to*," &c.

Having more to observe on the phrase in question, I sent a second letter to *The Nation*, in which it appeared Oct. 31, 1872. And there, after copying and commenting on Mr. White's remark, "Mr. Hall has shown that the phrase was used about a hundred and fifty years ago," I mentioned that I had very lately found 'different *to*' in Sir Arthur Gorges (1619), in Brathwait (1640), and in Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 239.

Regarding Mr. White's offer of material contributory to my book which the reader now has before him, I wrote:

"'You appear very different to me *from* what you were lately'; 'you appear very indifferent to me *to* what you were lately'. Here, says Mr. White, are examples of 'different *from*' and 'different *to*'. But, surely, *indifferent* is not *different*, or, in the sense which it bears in the latter of these passages, even the opposite of *different*. There is, here, just as much a play on words as there is on *concision* and *circumcision* in *Philippians*, iii., 2, 3, or in the Greek original. Nor does it follow, that, because, for instance, *dependent* takes *on*, *independent* must be followed by the same preposition. That our ancestors put *on* and

from after *independent*, I am aware. Besides, what preposition but *to* could *indifferent* take, the meaning being 'as compared with'? We say 'this is ordinary *to* that.' Bishop Bale, with a keen appreciation of the odium theologicum, wrote, before 1563:

'There is no malyce *to* the malyce of the clergye'."

Coleridge says, and says very justly: "Talk to a blind man: he knows he wants the sense of sight, and willingly makes the proper allowances. But there are certain internal senses, which a man may want, and yet be wholly ignorant that he wants them." One of these senses Mr. White wants, most undeniably. For the following, from his pen, appeared in *The New-York Times* of June 7, 1873: "I recently . . . furnished Dr. Hall with a very peculiar use of 'different *to*', somewhat earlier than any with which he seemed to be acquainted, and directed his attention to my own incidental discussion, nearly twenty years past, of *that phrase, to the consideration of which he has, since then, given his whole mind*, that is, all of it that he did not put into his recent exemplification of pedantry, which seemed, at first, a mischievous attack, but a second perusal showed me that his pages were

'Tantidem, quasi fœta canes, sine dentibu' latrat:'

and, as I turned to the line, I was reminded, moreover, that, in the words of the same author, he was of that

'stolidum genus Æacidorum,
Bellipotentes sunt magi' quam sapientipotentes.'"

Mr. White is anxious, evidently, to have it believed, that he supplemented the fruit of my researches. Yet how could I have explained more clearly than I had explained, that he did nothing of the kind? Who does not see, that he did not exemplify 'different *to*' at all? Really, I am compelled to say to him, as somebody once said to somebody else: "Intelligentiam, non intellectum, adfero." Why, too, has he brought forward this matter, if not with purpose to make out that he has laid me under an obligation, to the increase of his own credit, by adding to my previous stock of knowledge?

It is not clear whether Mr. White means that I have given, with a reservation, my "whole mind" to 'different *to*', since Sept., 1872, or since "nearly twenty years past." And it little signifies. Only how was he to know, that, even since Sept., 1872, I had given the point a single thought? Vague petulant flings of this sort, besides being much too cheap for any person of proper self-respect to indulge in, must, in the very nature of things, be essentially untruthful, and betray a most obtuse condition of moral sensibility. For the rest, it sometimes befals, that a man goes off at score, and, by merely a line or two, enables the world to take his exact intellectual measure. Of this description are the lines which I have italicized.

By "recent exemplification of pedantry", Mr. White alludes to my *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*, in which I have anatomized some samples of his maunderings on words and phrases. The contents of that work he is pleased, by a quotation from Ennius, to liken to the barking of a pregnant toothless bitch! Fie! fie! discomposed good sir. Why, in what Oliver Goldsmith calls a brachistochrone, choose to take an ethical header, and befoul yourself spontaneously with the very garbage of the ungentle? Besides, you know that I have not written under a pseudonym, but that I am what Steele's Phillis, in *The Conscious Lovers*, means by "an odious filthy male creature". Why, then, rob me of my sex? As to doggishness, in nothing, so far as I can see, am I at all like a *canes* parturient, or, indeed, even like a *canes* maiden. Furthermore, if you were bent on insinuating that I was canine, but an innocuous specimen of caninity, you might have had your will, without going out of English, and in language not only tolerably decorous, but intelligible to your supporters; as thus:

> "Thy toothless jaws should free thee from the fight:
> Thou canst but mumble, when thou meanst to bite."

If I can no more concur with Mr. White in taste than I can in judgment, few, I am sure, will be disposed to dissent from me. Except at second hand, I know nothing of the notions of decency which prevail among respectable people in the chief city of my native State; but I have been grossly misinformed, if my lampooner be a favourable representative of them. In answer to his coarseness, I shall not even honour him by a search for his parallel. Brunck, to be sure, delighted, like him, to grovel in the cesspools of fetid epithets; but Brunck was a man of learning, and, therefore, is not here to be utilized for purposes of comparison.

As regards Mr. White's second bit of very unrecondite Latin, its applicability is, equally with that of his first, a riddle. If Mr. White here understands what he quotes,—which I very much doubt,—he taxes me, for exposing him, with impolicy. The race of the Æacidæ are reported to have been beef-witted, and mightier in war than in prudence. Therefore, according to Mr. White, I am one of them; and, though I have never been a soldier, he publishes this to the world, as if he were charging some heavy dragoon, or other professional man of blood, who had blunderingly beaten his sword and revolver into steel-pens. But it is all one, most likely, to Mr. White's clients. Græcum est, non legendum, the old monks used to whisper, with a holy shudder; and the illiterate, when they see Latin hurled at one in wrath, of course assume it to be something very demolishing. The admirers of Mr. White would, no doubt, at once believe my extinction imminent, if he were to call me an hypotenuse, or an ornithorhynchus. I should

hope it was rather late in the day, in New York especially, for any sciolist to imitate successfully the cosmogony-man of *The Vicar of Wakefield.*

All that Mr. White declaredly finds, in my *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology*, is "pedantry"; and this, agreeably to Dr. Johnson, is "awkward ostentation of needless learning", or "the unseasonable ostentation of learning." Now, of philologizing I know but one rational method,—accumulating facts, and bringing common-sense to bear upon them. Mr. White's staple, in his *Words and Their Uses*, is made up, chiefly, of negative assertions and of personal prejudices. Against these I array, in my critique, substantial masses of quotations directly pertinent to expressions which have been impugned,—now to prove the long currency and establishment of one phrase, now to show that another phrase has the sanction of the most eminent modern usage, and so on and so on. If, where Mr. White denies, I had replied by simply affirming, how could it have been known who was right, and who was wrong? There was but one satisfactory way of meeting him; and that I took. His rejoinder is admirable in its simplicity,—bad temper, worse manners, two similes, and an accusation of pedantry.

If he had betrayed only want of knowledge and inability to reason, and had stopped there, I should have stopped with indicating that want and that inability. But he did not stop there. To say no more of his ignorance, and of his impotence of logic, I encountered, in his book, to a degree which I never saw surpassed in any second book, arrogance of attitude, self-opinionative dogmatism, and the most intolerant disdain of all who differ from himself; and on these peculiarities, over and above confuting his philologastry, I bestowed the designations which such things, especially when aggravated by combination, inevitably invite. A sense of fit characterization has led me, I acknowledge, to employ divers dyslogistic metaphors, in application to varying exhibitions of his deplorable deficiency of scholarship, and of himself, as an implied "glass of fashion", and type of high-class æsthetic intuition. In every case, however, I have studied appropriateness and just proportion. I would urge, with Hobbes: "I am not so inhuman as not to pardon dulness or madness: they are not voluntary faults. But, when men adventure, voluntarily, to talk of that they understand not, censoriously and scornfully, I may tell them of it"; and with Bentley: "There 's nothing so nauseous and provoking as a superficial ostentation of learning, while profound ignorance lies at the bottom."

Of the style of retort which Mr. White accounts becoming, I have said enough. And the same style, in all its essentials, is that of his half-educated and ill-bred satellites. My facts, arguments, and conclusions, both he and they, as unmistakeably as if they categorically avowed it, recognize to be absolutely impregnable; and, in unwise

alternative to silence, they sluice me with hap-hazard billingsgate. It is idle for them to hope, that their affecting to make light account of me will not be interpreted by others, and rightly, as a clutching at the last straw of despair. Genuine contempt is anything rather than clamorous; but the vulgar, when alarmed and irritated, invariably seek relief in a free secretion of scurrility. It is not thus that what I have called false philology can be made out to be true.

P. 80, note 1. 'Different *to*' is used by Mrs. Lennox, in *The Female Quixote* (1752), Vol. 1, p. 57 (ed. 1820).

P. 82, note 2. For "disagree *from*", also see *The French Academie*, Part 1 (ed. 1589), p. 90: Hakewill, *An Apologie*, &c. (ed. 1630), p. 192.

P. 88, note 1. Other old instances of *respect*, for 'relation', 'reference', here follow.

"Bondemenne are, in *respecte* and comparison, the feete[e] of their maisters, & these as the heddes of the servauntes." Udall, *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), fol. 148 r and v. Also see fol. 59 r.

"Seven are they named here, in a universal *respect* both of the times, persons, places, and perverse doctrines of the whole world." Bishop Bale, *Select Works* (1849), p. 471.

"But, in this canon, hee disclaimes any jurisdiction to judge of titles, which those Popes tooke to themselves, who excommunicated our late Queene (if Parsons say true, that they had *respect* to the injustice of her title, by reason of a statute), and all those Popes must doe, which shall doe any act which might make this oath unlawfull to you." Dr. Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (1610), pp. 309, 310.

P. 107, note 3. Both *frugality* and *temperance* were used by Udall in 1542. See, for these words, his *Apophthegmes*, &c., fol. 90, 128, 189, 253, and fol. 128.

P. 108, l. 3. Udall, in his *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), plainly indicates that several of his words were, in his day, uncommon. Of *pedagogue* he gives, before using it, a long explanation. Fol. 182, 183. "*Parasites* wer called suche smellefeastes as would seeke to bee free geastes at riche mennes tables." Fol. 199. "A *clime* is a region or coste of a countree." Fol. 216. *Prorogation* is explained by "a longer tyme in his dictature." Fol. 278. *Stratagems* are defined as "the sleightes and policies of warre." Fol. 279. *Geography* is "the descripcion of the yearth"; and *fountains* are "hedsprynges." Fol. 285.

In one case, Udall glosses a word which had been ventured long before his time. "An *epitaphie* is the writyng that is sette on dedde mennes toumbes or graves, in memorie or commendacion of the parties there buiried." Fol. 196, 197. For *epitafi*, see Capgrave's *Chronicle*, p. 125; for *epitaff*, Lydgate's *Minor Poems* (ed. 1840), p. 93.

P 109, l. 2 and note 1. *Diction*, with Sir Philip Sidney, has the

sense it now bears. Donne, in making it mean 'word',—a classical acceptation of *dictio*,—had been anticipated. Udall, in his *Apophthegmes* (1542), employs three synonyms of 'word', one of which is *vocable*. The others are *diction*, fol. 121, 129, 200, 241, 243, 245; and *voice*, fol. 112, 121, 125, 164.

P. 111, l. 12. Udall used *contaminate*, the verb. See his *Apophthegmes*, &c. (1542), "The Preface of Erasmus."

P. 111. In the comedy of *Patient Grissil*, by Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, published in 1603, Emulo exemplifies what is called "the gallimaufry of language", by many words such as the substantives *collocution*, *delinquishment*, *disconsolation*, *imprision*, *synteresis*, and the verbs *conglutinate*, *imperish*, *oblivionize*, *recuperate*, *vapulate*, *vulnerate*. These, doubtless, were among the affectations of the time. *Incongruent*, ventured some generations before, was then still strange, and, in fact, never found wide acceptation. *Adulatory*, too, was looked on as outlandish; and it is not much more than a century since it really became English.

P. 122, note 2. Dr. Richardson quotes, for the verb neuter *smoulder*, Gascoigne and Dryden, also.

P. 132, foot. *Devilry* is used by Bishop Bale, *Select Works* (1849), p. 354.

P. 133, notes, ll. 9, 10. I should have written: Dr. Richardson gives, for modern times, the participial adjective *humiliating*, only.

P. 141, l. 13. I may mention that the word *adjectival* was used long before Dr. Latham's day, as by William Taylor. See *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 24 (1797), p. 558: *The Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 12 (1801), p. 98. And Bentham has it.

P. 155, note 3. *Livelehood*, that is to say, our modern *livelihood*, is used by Udall, *Apophthegmes* (1542), fol. 322.

P. 156, note 1. Since this note was printed, I have found, that, in the Amsterdam edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, published in 1698, Milton is made to write *help meet*, in Book 1, Ch. 2. In the editions of 1738 and 1753, the reading is *help-meet*.

For this information I am indebted to a very intelligent, critical, and kind friend, Mr. Frederic Pincott, who has often laid me under obligation by assistance he has rendered me in my philological researches.

P. 162, notes, ll. 1—3. I am aware that forms like *enfans*, for *enfants*, were not first used in modern times. For particulars, see M. Génin, *Récréations Philologiques*, Vol. 1, pp. 354—368.

P. 162, note 1. *Bastile*, for 'dungeon', is very old English. See Lydgate, *Minor Poems* (ed. 1840), p. 207 (*bis*).

P. 173, l. 14. *Suburbian* is used by William Rowley, *A Search for Money* (1609), p. 37 (ed. 1840).

P. 180, note 4. Like *symbology* are *symbolatry* and *symbolatrous*,

used by the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, in *The Origin and Development of Religious Belief* (ed. 1871), Vol. 1, p. 185. Among other monstrous formations occurring in the same volume, are the following. *Heliatic*, p. 147. *Relativibility*, p. 210. *Ideolatry*, p. 187. *Ideographic*, p. 253. *Anthropomorphize*, p. 239. *Hypostatize*, p. 394.

P. 211, note 2. *Altitudes*, for 'heroics', is used by Mrs. Lennox, *The Female Quixote* (1752), Vol. 1, p. 165 (ed. 1820).

P. 219, l. 7. Can *carriwitchet* be a corruption of *colifichet*?

P. 226, note 3. *Dispense*, substantive, once meant 'expense'; and the verb *dispend*, 'expend'. See Lydgate, *Minor Poems* (ed. 1840), pp. 166, 167, 196, 208, and p. 210. The latter is used by so late a writer as Hakewill. See his *An Apologie*, &c. (ed. 1630), p. 352.

P. 240, note 8. Add the three following illustrative extracts:

"The bread and the wine were left us for a sacramental communion, or a *mutual* participation of the inestimable benefits of his most precious death and blood-shedding." Mrs. Anne Askewe (1546?), in Bishop Bale's *Select Works*, p. 196.

"Ye will, paraventure, say, it is Christ's body. But, truly, that is all false. For thereof is no *mutual* participation, where one eateth up all." Bishop Bale, *Select Works*, p. 627.

"Numbring up the holy dayes, hee concludes, at last, that neither any processe hold, nor sentence bee in force, pronounced on any of those dayes, though both parts *mutually* should consent unto it." Heylin, *The History of the Sabbath* (ed. 1636), Book 2, p. 159.

P. 264, note 3. Add: "So would he woundrefull pacientely take merie bourdyng,—yea, some tymes beeyng *with* the largest and over plainly, — either begonne, orels reversed backe again upon hym." Udall, *Apophthegmes* (1542), fol. 243 v.

"The same Julia begoonne, somewhat *with* the soonest, to have whyte heares in hir hedde." *Id.*, *ibid.*, fol. 252 v.

Also see Sir Philip Sidney, *Arcadia* (ed. 1613), p. 154.

P. 280, l. 16. The following is from Lydgate:

> "Cheese we the roosys, cast away the thorn,
> Criste boute us alle with his precious bloode:
> To that he bouhte us lat no thyng be lorn;
> For our redempcioun he *starf* upon the rood."
> *Minor Poems* (ed. 1840), p. 149.

P. 288, note 5. The substantive *democratic* was used, I find, in 1681, in the Preface to Heylin's *De Jure Paritatis Episcoporum*, by the Rev. George Vernon. Robert Southwell has *domesticals* for *domestics*. See *A Hundred Meditations*, &c. (ed. 1873), p. 167.

P. 304, note 4. *Centenary*, for 'aggregate of a hundred', is used by Heylin, *The History of the Sabbath* (ed. 1636), Book 1, p. 23.

INDEX OF AUTHORS, ETC.

*** The letter *f.*, where attached to the number of a page, is intended to denote the pages immediately following.

Abbot, Archbishop, 74.
Abbott, Dr. E. A., 265, 353.
Addison, Joseph, 9, 42, 55, 62, 66, 80, 82, 91, 117, 119, 120, 126, 148, 174, 190, 198, 231, 233, 234, 250, 255, 292, 294, 357, 362.
Addison and Steele, 233.
Aleman, 112.
Alford, Dean, 74, 77, 78, 84, 87.
Andrewes, Bishop, 82, 92, 242.
Aquinas, Thomas, 144.
Aristarchus, 143.
Arnold, Mr. Matthew, 82, 234, 306, 330, 331.
Arnold, Dr. Thomas, 53, 191, 300, 307, 328.
Ascham, Roger, 47, 67, 93, 161, 175, 352, 353, 355, 359.
Ashwell, Rev. George, 213.
Askewe, Mrs. Anne, 368.
Augustine, St., 129.
Bacon (Lord Verulam), Francis, 14, 35, 43, 86, 99, 266, 307.
Bailey, Nathaniel, 116.
Bailey, Mr. Samuel, 44, 56, 72.
Baker, Robert, 80, 211.
Baker, Rev. Thomas, 43.
Bale, Bishop, 40, 75, 145, 223, 336, 352, 353, 361, 362, 363, 366, 367, 368.
Baring-Gould, Rev. S., 330, 368.
Barlow, Joel, 297.
Barrow, Dr. Isaac, 43, 58, 65, 83, 89, 91, 92, 160, 180, 186, 189, 206, 272, 276, 284, 286.
Barry, Spranger, 133.
Bartlett, Mr. J. R., 80.
Baxter, Rev. Richard, 131.
Beattie, Dr., 103, f., 123.
Beaumont and Fletcher, 189.
Becher, William, 283.
Beckford, William, 53, 105, 225, 260, 271, 331, 333, 348.
Bentham, Jeremy, 19, 20, 31, 159, 185, 228, 270, 283, 297, 309, 317, 325, 367.
Bentley, Dr. Richard, 8, 9, 33, 82, 90, 96, 116, f., 132, 137, 155, 180, 189, 217, 229, 241, 255, 261, 305, 360, 365.
Berkeley, Bishop, 281.
Berkeley, Mr., 256.
Bernard, Rev. Richard, 224, 272.
Bickerstaffe, Isaac, 211, 228, 239, 240, 250, 255.
Bickerstaffe and Foote, 253, 258.
Blackley, Rev. W. L., 57, 77, 78, 79, 172, 181, 295.
Blackstone, Sir William, 118, 133.
Blackwell, Dr. Thomas, 121.
Bolingbroke, Lord, 178, 318.
Bolton, Edmund, 109, 132.
Booth, Mr. David, 337.
Boucher, Rev. Jonathan, 47, 128, 159, 215.
Bowditch, Mr. N. I., 273.
Boyle, Hon. Charles, 116, 117, 118, 119.
Boyle, Hon. Robert, 43, 122.
Brachet, M. A., 65.
Bradshaigh, Lady, 63.
Brathwait, Richard, 42, 46, 47, 80, 89, 93, 133, 173, 180, 187, 910,

226, 232, 241, 270, 272, 362.
Bretland, Rev. John, 325.
Brewer, Mr. Fisk P., 352.
Brontë, Miss Charlotte, 81, 194.
Brooke, Henry, 35, 43, 50, 52, 160, 206, 210, 211, 213, 214, 220, 221, 224, 230, 231, 235, 237, 239, 244, 246, 247, 248, 249, 252, 253, 254, 256, 259, 263, 265, 268, 288, 300, 318.
Browne, Sir Thomas, 43, 46, 128, 191, 287.
Browning, Mr. Robert, 151.
Bruce, Dr. John, 191.
Brunck, R. F. P., 364.
Buckingham, Duke of, 160.
Bull, Bishop, 145.
Bulwer, Mr. E. L. (Lord Lytton), 72.
Burguy, M. G. F., 65.
Burke, Edmund, 43, 52, 69, 131, 132, 184, 208, 212, 219, 222, 224, 225, 238, 239, 241, 244, 254, 257, 260, 262, 266, 276, 282, 283, 284, 285, 287, 288, 294, 296, 298, 299, 305, 306, 317.
Burnaby. *See* Wilson, B., & Co.
Burney, Miss Frances (Madame D'Arblay), 53, 80, 82, 83, 121, 125, 128, 172, 191, 208, 210, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 227, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 242, 243, 244, 249, 253, 260, 261, 262, 264, 267, 268, 271, 340.
Burthogge, Dr. Richard, 75, 118, 185.
Butler, Rev. Charles, 356.
Byron, Lord, 28, 44, 304.
Cæsar, Julius, 34.
Caillière, M., 288.
Cambridge, R. O., 80, 121, 156, 223.
Camden, Lord. 207.
Camden, William, 6, 7, 61, 107, 133, 137, 190.
Campe, J. H., 99.
Campion, Thomas, 185.
Canning, George, 260, 266.
Capgrave, 45, 276, 358, 366.
Carey, Henry, 51.
Carlell, Lodowick, 172, 211, 229.
Carlyle, Mr. Thomas, 19, 132, 151, 184, 189, 331.
Carter, Miss Elizabeth, 12. 52, 55, 122, 123, 125, 176, 187, 207, 208, 209, 215, 217, 219, 222. 223, 228, 231, 238, 239, 245, 267, 302.
Casaubon, Dr. Meric, 156.
Castalion, Sebastian, 112.
Catullus, 14, 70, 327.
Centlivre, Mrs. Susanna, 156, 190, 228, 240, 245, 262.
Cervantes, 28.
Chalmers, Dr. Thomas, 48.
Chapman, Dr. George, 64, 187.
Chaucer, 4, 9, 11, 57, 64, 65, 123, 196, 358.
Cheke, Sir John, 3, 4, 278.
Chesterfield, Lord, 125, 144, 159, 221, 288.
Chettle, Henrie, 80, 111, 174, 186, 205, 250, 259, 264, 314, 361, 367.
Chillingworth, Rev. William, 68.
Cibber, Colley, 156, 176, 253, 259.
Cibber, Mrs. S. M., 63.
Cibber, Theophilus, 80, 230.
Cicero, 2, 8, 70, 158, 186, 278.
Clarendon, Lord, 65, 326.
Clark, Mr. Bracy, 175.
Clinton, Mr. H. F., 173.
Clive, Mrs. Catherine, 272.
Clough, Mr. A. H., 51.
Cobbe, Miss F. P., 180.
Cobbett, William, 18, 138, 139.
Cockeram, Henry, 131, 138, 298.
Coghan, Dr. Thomas, 361.
Cole, Rev. Thomas, 318.
Colebrooke, Mr. H. T., 283, 310.
Coleridge, S. T., 21, 63, 68, 70, 71, f., 82, 85, 105, 106, 121, 130, 132, 133, 152, 157, 168, 171, 178, 183, 184, 194, 197, 213, 255, 261, 269, 283, 285, 286, 289, 305, 306, 314, 315, 317, 323, 327, 329, 336, 363.
Collier, Rev. Jeremy, 55, 61, 66, 119, 128, 160, 168, 180, 189, 211, 223, 226, 235, 254, 268.
Colman, George, 35, 53, 62, 63, 117, 124, 128, 156, 206, 207,

208, 211, 212, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 227, 228, 230, 231, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 244, 248, 249, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 263, 266, 267, 269, 271, 312, 318, 342.
Colman and Garrick, 217.
Colman and Thornton, 10, 80, 82, 156, 206, 211, 215, 217, 262, 264.
Congreve, William, 119.
Constable, Henry, 79.
Conway, Gen. H. S., 208, 209, 238, 251.
Corke, Earl of, 241.
Cottington, Lord Francis, 132.
Cousin, M. Victor, 303.
Cowell, Dr. John, 90.
Cowley, Abraham, 8, 14, 43, 180, 183, 247.
Cowley, Mrs. Hannah, 208, 218, 231, 235, 238, 250, 271, 273.
Cowper, William, 53, 55, 62, 74, 82, 95, 99, 108, , 124, 127, 139, 149, 176, 184, 190, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 223, 227, 228, 233, 238, 240, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 251, 253, 255, 259, 267, 268, 269, 283, 299, 301, 312.
Creasy, Sir Edward, 17, 141.
Cromwell, Oliver, 119.
Cudworth, Dr. Ralph, 128.
Cumberland, Richard, 148, 207, 208, 209, 217, 228, 233, 234, 236, 239, 241, 244, 255, 257, 259, 260, 263, 271, 306.
Dacres, Edward, 59, 82.
Dasent, Dr. G. W., 55.
D'Avenant, Sir William, 229.
Davis, Sir John, 331.
De Foe, 82, 123, 128, 160, 168, 190, 206, 215, 228, 236, 265, 296, 337.
Dekker, Thomas, 79, 112, 173, 189, 211, 217, 223, 229, 246, 261, 272, 332.
Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, 80, 250, 259, 361, 367.
De Quincey, Mr. Thomas, 29, 55, 63, 69, 82, 83, 84, 106, 130, 140, 158, 171, 174, 175, 180, 183, 184, 186, 191, 194, 269, 275, 283, 285, 292, 298, 300, 301, 302, 304, 306, 307, 317, 328.
Derham, Dr. W., 160.
De Vere, Prof. M. S., 220, 234.
Dibdin, Charles, 217, 240, 253, 254.
Dibdin, Thomas, 128, 230, 233, 241.
Dickens, Mr. Charles, 82, 242, 257, 331.
Disraeli, Mr. B., 242.
D'Israeli, Mr. Isaac, 43, 44, 120, 296.
Donne, Dr., 42, 44, 88, 109, 132, 133, 144, 145, 159, 181, 186, 188, 258, 286, 366, 367.
Douce, Francis, 133.
Doyle, Sir F. H., 161.
Dryden, 10, 11, 14, 21, 120, 123, 144, 149, 187, 190, 217, 229, 253, 281, 293, 367.
Ducange, 64, 144.
Dumast, M. P. G. de, 202.
Dupré, William, 100, 129, 201.
Dyce, Rev. A., 137.
Earle, Rev. John, 322.
Eastwood, Mr. J., 353.
Eaton, Rev. John, 46, 87, 90, 93, 189.
Echlin, Lady, 52.
Eden, Richarde, 108, 109.
Edwards, Thomas, 183, 261.
Elyot, Sir Thomas, 45, 67, 79, 88, 93, 107, 108, 109, 122, 137, 167, 188, 305, 352.
Ennius, 15, 364.
Estienne, Henri, 4, 15, 50.
Etherege, Sir George, 218.
Eusden, Rev. Lawrence, 101.
Evelyn, John, 287.
Fanshawe, Sir Richard, 188.
Farquhar, George, 362.
Feltham, Owen, 21, 42, 62, 74, 75, 88, 242, 286.
Fielding, Henry, 151, 190, 246.
Fish, Simon, 352.
Fiske, Mr. John, 46, 47.
Fleckno, Rev. Richard, 42, 120.

Fletcher, John, 271.
Florio, John, 178, 353.
Foote, Samuel, 67, 80, 124, 156, 173, 211, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 228, 230, 231, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 239, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 256, 257, 258, 261, 263, 313, 317.
Foster, Rev. John, 292.
Fowler, Prof. W. C., 346.
Fox, C. J., 21, 331.
Fox, John, 287.
Franck, Richard, 93, 111, 118, 157, 174, 236, 239.
Franklin, Benjamin, 285, 286.
Freeman, Dr. E. A., 296, 299, 300, 330.
Frere, John, 266.
Fuller, Dr. Thomas, 42, 50, 55, 59, 75, 113, 116, 158, 159, 173, 176, 187, 188, 207, 215, 229, 232, 241, 254, 268, 283, 285, 332, 337, 361.
Gainsford, Thomas, 42, 117.
Galt, John, 320.
Garrick, David, 121, 217, 219, 233, 238, 246, 249, 254, 258.
Gascoigne, 367.
Gataker, Rev. Thomas, 68, 90, 145, 241, 242, 266.
Gaule, Rev. John, 26, 38, 44, 75, 81, 82, 117, 131, 132, 133, 157, 179, 186, 265, 286, 287.
Gay, John, 51, 125, 210, 222, 231, 246, 259.
Gellius, Aulus, 34.
Génin, M. F., 129, 367.
Gibbs, Prof. J. W., 337.
Gibbon, Edmund, 53, 55, 56, 83, 117, 118, 168, 202, 208, 222, 264, 317.
Gladstone, Mr. W. E., 298, 300, 301, 307, 308.
Glanvill, Rev. Joseph, 31, 42, 80, 82, 89, 117, 144, 160, 168, 183, 189, 211, 229, 268, 284, 286.
Godwin, William, 8, 10, 11, 69, 82, 83, 121, 160, 164, 186, 207, 214, 216, 223, 225, 246, 264, 271, 287, 291, 296, 300, 306.
Godwin, Mrs., 126, 249, 262.
Goethe, 164.
Goldsmith, Dr. Oliver, 52, 190, 197, 207, 208, 210, 212, 213, 218, 219, 220, 225, 227, 228, 231, 237, 238, 240, 249, 251, 253, 260, 262, 266, 267, 269, 271, 272, 306, 325, 364.
Gorges, Sir Arthur, 80, 93, 117, 362.
Gosson, Rev. Stephen, 67.
Gower, 45, 64.
Graves, Rev. Richard, 53, 82, 122, 123, 178, 210, 219, 223, 234, 235, 237, 239, 240, 243, 245, 247, 257, 262, 265, 268, 269, 337.
Gray, Thomas, 42, 52, 67, 70, 103, 123, 127, 148, 162, 176, 207, 208, 210, 220, 221, 228, 245, 247, 249, 250, 262, 326.
Greene, Robert, 79.
Grenville (William Wyndham), Lord, 70, 85.
Grimstone, Viscount, 229, 247, 263.
Grote, Professor John, 168.
Grove, Rev. Henry, 215.
Guizot, M., 153.
Gurnhill, Rev. James, 80.
Hakewill, Dr. George, 79, 232, 304, 366, 368.
Hakluyt, Rev. Richard, 212.
Hall, Bishop, 56, 74.
Hall, Rev. T. D., 322.
Hallam, Henry, 83, 101, 132, 297.
Halle, Edward, 128.
Halle, Dr. John, 58, 314.
Hallifax, Bishop, 123, 227, 235, 310, 316.
Hare, Archdeacon, 102, 139, 316.
Harington, Sir John, 109, 143.
Harris, James, 239, 258, 266, 270, 351.
Harrison, Mr. M., 337.
Harvey, Gabriell, 79, 109, 110, 111, 112, 133, 190, 356.
Haughton, William, 80, 250, 259, 361, 367.
Hawkesworth, Dr. John, 148, 206, 209, 245.
Hawkins, Sir John, 119, 332.

Hawthorne, Mr. N., 173.
Hayward, James, 58, 68, 80, 133, 155, 172, 174, 187.
Haywarde, Sir John, 88, 167, 264, 271.
Hazlitt, William, 69, 102, 218, 306.
Heber, Bishop, 283, 307.
Helps, Sir Arthur, 17.
Herbert, Sir Thomas, 128.
Hesketh, Lady, 80.
Heylin, Dr. Peter, 41, 44, 93, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 137, 185, 190, 215, 234, 272, 285, 286, 368.
Heywood, Thomas, 190.
Hieron, Rev. Samuel, 46, 108, 148, 155.
Hill, Aaron, 121, 176, 215, 258.
Hoadly, Dr. John, 124, 273.
Hobbes, Thomas, 19, 31, 89, 288, 355, 365.
Hoby, Sir Thomas, 4.
Hodges, Richard, 160, 360, 361.
Hodgson, Dr. Shadworth H., 335.
Holinshed, Raphael, 45, 46, 122.
Holland, Dr. Philemon, 59, 113, 155, 167, 187, 212, 214, 265, 285, 307.
Hooker, Rev. Richard, 35, 115.
Hope, Mr. A. J. B. B., 318.
Horace, 70, 150, 198.
Horne, Bishop, 67, 211.
Horneck, Dr. Anthony, 247, 351.
Hotten, Mr. J. C., 130.
Howell, James, 40, 42, 57, 63, 75, 80, 157, 167, 173, 232, 304, 313.
Hughes, John, 184.
Hughes, Mr. Thomas, 81.
Hugo Carrensis, 50.
Hugo, M. Victor, 153.
Hurd, Bishop, 52, 190, 235, 252, 265.
Hutcheson, Dr. Francis, 133.
Huxley, Prof. T. H., 295, 304, 330.
Inchbald, Mrs. Elizabeth, 207, 208, 214, 217, 228, 230, 231, 232, 243, 249, 265, 269.
James, Dr. Thomas, 132, 185, 223, 272.
Jarvis, Charles, 323, 324.
Jeffries, Miss, 250.
Jephson, Robert, 128, 233, 263.
Jewell, Bishop, 122, 331.
Jodrell, Mr. R. P., 156, 186.
Johnson, Charles, 90, 160, 240, 245, 247, 248, 253, 273, 305, 340.
Johnson, Richard, 79.
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17, 22, 35, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 61, 62, 65, 70, 75, 77, 79, 88, 90, 93, 95, 101, 103, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 139, 140, 143, 144, 148, 160, 166, 168, 172, 177, 184, 188, 190, 192, 196, 198, f., 207, 208, 215, 216, 217, 218, 222, 223, 225, 235, 236, 240, 243, 244, 245, 251, 256, 258, 263, 269, 270, 275, 281, 285, 286, 287, 289, 294, 296, 303, 304, 315, 317, 318, 319, 333, 337, 365.
Jones, Edward, 117.
Jones, Sir William, 55, 124, 225, 235, 275.
Jones, Rev. William, 80, 90, 225, 234, 252, 286, 287, 318.
Jonson, Ben, 14, 47, 79, 106, 157, 161, 174, 187, 189, 165, 353, 354, 355, 357.
Jordan, Thomas, 10.
Kelly, Hugh, 234, 253.
Kenney, James, 230, 251, 253, 261.
Kilmore, Bishop of, 211.
Kingsley, Rev. Charles, 132, 156, 187, 194, 213, 230, 262, 300, 331.
Knight, R. P., 231, 260.
Knighte, William, 358, 359.
Kuster, Dr. Ludolph, 33.
La Bruyère, 153.
Lactantius, 18.
La Fontaine, 100.
Lamb, Charles, 46, 68, 69, 103, 121, 156, 157, 191, 283, 297, 313, 323, 327, 329.
Landor, W. S., 13, 14, 15, 17, 29, 41, 45, 54, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62,

67, 69, 71, 82, 83, 103, 105, 117, 183, 184, 191, 192, 206, 255, 267, 270, 285, 288, 290, 298, 302, 323, 327, 329, 331, 343.
Lansdowne, Lord, 236.
Lansdowne, Marquis of, 296.
Larchey, M. Lorédan, 288.
Latham, Dr. R. G., 46, 124, 132, 133, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 319, 367.
Latimer, Bishop, 47, 173, 188.
Laveaux, M. J. C., 13, 129.
Lavington, Bishop, 58, 66, 157, 220, 247, 261.
Lawrence, Rev. Matthew, 72, 90.
Lee, Professor S., 173.
Lempriere, N., 94.
Lennox, Mrs. Charlotte, 366, 368.
L'Estrange, Hamon, 41, 44, 47, 90, 91, 114, 115, 117, 118, 167, 189, 224, 241, 272, 353, 356.
L'Estrange, Sir Roger, 223.
Lewis, Matthew G., 325.
Leycester, Mr., 251.
Lind, John, 119.
Lithgow, William, 46, 134, 155, 167.
Littré, M. E., 64.
Lloyd, Bishop, 121.
Lloyd, Charles, 81, 83.
Lloyd, Robert, 228.
Lockhart, J. G., 184.
Longfellow, Prof. H. W., 131.
Lowell, Mr. J. R., 193.
Lowth, Bishop, 62, 77, 79, 90, 119, 207, 210, 213, 220, 224, 227, 234, 235, 236, 239, 246, 251, 252, 263, 265, 270, 357.
Lydgate, 352, 355, 358, 359, 360, 366, 367, 368.
Lyly, John, 79, 186, 356.
Lyttelton, Lord, 228.
Lytton, Lord, 99, f., 139, 207, 214, 262, 298.
Mabbe, James, 46, 47, 50, 63, 68, 80, 90, 112, 162, 180, 185, 188, 218, 232, 243, 247, 250, 254, 264, 283, 313, 354.
Macaulay, Lord, 13, 17, 54, 62, 69, 84, 129, 130, 141, 142, 150, 156, 171, 213, 216, 248, 264, 283, 285, 289, 292, 293, 300, 303, 306, 307, 317, 319, 331.
Macaulay, Mrs. C., 186.
Mackintosh, Sir James, 21, 43.
Macklin, Charles, 201, 208, 263.
Macrobius, 34, 64.
Maillard, Olivier, 50.
Maitland, Dr. S. R., 313.
Malone, Edmond, 285.
Mandeville, Dr. Bernard de, 68, 160, 234.
Mandeville, Sir John, 146.
Marsh, Mr. G. P., 45, 46, 49, f., 77, f., 198, 252, 273, 324, 332, 337, 338, 346, 348, 349, 352, 353, 355.
Martial, 128.
Martyn, Rev. Henry, 296.
Mason, Rev. William, 212, 270.
Massinger, 173, 253, 303.
Mathias, T. J., 105, 248, 317.
Mede, Rev. Joseph, 255, 268.
Ménage, 64.
Menander, 25.
Mendoza, D. H. de, 42.
Middleton, Dr. Conyers, 294.
Mill, James, 313.
Mill, Mr. J. S., 83, 181, 296, 304, 320.
Milman, Dean, 18, 304.
Milton, 14, 42, 70, 72, 82, 89, 100, 105, 114, 119, 133, 147, 149, 150, 156, 157, 160, 161, 173, 185, 187, 190, 212, 218, 232, 265, 284, 285, 289, 293, 343, 367.
Monboddo, Lord, 30.
Monmouth (Henry Cary), Earl of, 70, 75, 132, 139, 160, 162, 167, 174, 190, 221, 307, 356.
Monro, Rev. T., 233.
Montagu, Lady Mary W., 118.
Moore, Edward, 52, 125, 156, 216, 285.
More, Miss Hannah, 208, 225, 271.
More, Dr. Henry, 42, 43, 82, 89, 116, 128, 132, 158, 166, 167, 175, 180, 284, 288.
More, Sir Thomas, 58, 109, 114, 122, 132, 190, 229, 352, 361.
Morris, Dr. Richard, 79, 322, 353.

Motteux, P. A., 45.
Müller, Prof. Maximilian, 54, 55.
Mulso, Miss, 213.
Murphy, Arthur, 128, 208, 210, 217, 218, 233, 234, 247, 248, 249, 250, 258, 259, 263.
Nares, Archdeacon, 272.
Nash, Thomas, 21, 61, 79, 110, 112, 131, 132, 133, 187, 261, 285, 286, 312.
Newman, Dr. J. H., 16, 17, 69, 82, 83, 144, 156, 177, 178, 191, 262, 264, 265, 267, 283, 291, 292, 296, 302, 304, 312, 329, 331, 342.
Newton, Rev. John, 48, 296.
Norden, John, 139, 188, 361, 362.
Norfolk, Duke of, 358.
Nott, Dr. John, 246, 256, 261.
O'Brien, Mr. Henry, 167.
O'Keeffe, John, 211, 218, 220, 230, 237, 243, 244, 248, 261, 266.
Otway, 189, 231.
Oxford, Earl of, 79.
Pace, Rev. Richard, 137.
Paley, Archdeacon, 83, 191, 216, 248, 260, 267, 283, 287, 307, 312.
Parr, Dr. Samuel, 35, 43, 148.
Pearson, Bishop, 89.
Pecock, Bishop, 43.
Philon, Frederic, 249, 257, 260.
Pilkington, Mrs. M., 223.
Plautus, 13, 159.
Pontanus, 1.
Pope, Alexander, 11, 40, 149, 190, 240.
Porson, Richard, 67, 253, 267, 273.
Porter, Henry, 79, 190, 249, 271.
Preston, Lord, 68, 265.
Price, Sir Uvedale, 53, 82, 125, 126, 160, 191, 207, 222, 224, 248, 258.
Priestley, Dr. Joseph, 11, 75, 104, 122, 212, 245, 246, 257, 264, 325.
Prynne, William, 132.
Puller, Dr. Timothy, 47, 75, 112.
Pusey, Dr. E. B., 296.
Puttenham, George, 5, 47, 59, 61, 74, 75, 79, 82, 93, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 179, 183, 188, 255, 273, 305, 353.
Pycroft, Rev. J., 81.
Pytches, Mr. John, 127.
Quintilian, 41.
Rabelais, 21, 100, 117.
Raynouard, M. F. J. M., 64, 65.
Reade, Mr. Charles, 25, 26, 82, 217, 230, 262, 331.
Reeve, Miss Clara, 226, 249.
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 214, 222, 236, 241, 255, 261, 271, 306.
Richardson, Dr. Charles, 44, 45, 72, 73, 80, 117, 122, 128, 132, 133, 134, 144, 145, 287, 319, 361, 367.
Richardson, Joseph, 270.
Richardson, Samuel, 51, 54, 66, 72, 80, 82, 120, 123, 125, 134, 161, 167, 168, 195, 210, 211, 214, 215, 217, 223, 225, 226, 227, 230, 231, 233, 234, 236, 239, 240, 248, 249, 250, 251, 254, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 271, 273, 285, 286, 287, 297, 298, 300, 320, 336.
Riche, Barnabe, 47, 50, 79, 88, 107, 267, 332.
Richelet, C. P., 232.
Roberd of Gloucester, 358.
Robinson, Mr. H. C., 331.
Robynson, Raphe, 67, 82, 189, 332, 352.
Roget, Dr. P. M., 38.
Rokeby, Lord, 318.
Roquefort, M. J. B. B., 65.
Roscommon, Earl of, 3.
Rosini, Sign. G., 83.
Rowlands, Samuel, 40, 93, 110, 112, 271.
Rowley, William, 367.
Ruskin, Mr. John, 28, 29, 34, 64, 156, 176, 181, 191, 201, 216, 259, 283, 315, 330.
Rust, Bishop, 89.
S. Victor, Hugo de, 144.
Sanderson, Bishop, 30, 47, 68, 72, 89, 93, 211, 285.
Scott, Sir Walter, 21, 28, 65, 132, 133, 262, 283, 284, 307.

Seneca, 6.
Sevigné, Madame de, 326.
Shakespeare, 24, 42, 47, 70, 79, 88, 92, 93, 105, 106, 109, 123, 125, 149, 160, 168, 173, 176, 189, 223, 240, 272, 300, 307, 346, 353.
Shelley, 62, 228, 264, 274, 297, 306, 328.
Shelley, Mrs., 328.
Shelton, Thomas, 283.
Shenstone, William, 52, 66, 80, 202, 219, 231, 266, 306.
Sheridan, R. B., 70, 178, 212, 225, 228, 233, 238, 240, 245, 254, 271.
Shipley, Bishop, 124, 209.
Sidney, Sir Philip, 9, 40, 109, 307, 366, 368.
Skillern, Mr. R. S., 326.
Smart, Mr. B. H., 140, 162, 308, 309.
Smith, John, 90.
Smith, Rev. Sydney, 53, 55, 105, 132, 176, 214, 217, 283.
Smith, Dr. W., 322.
South, Dr. Robert, 14, 281, 293.
Southey, Robert, 20, 21, 22, 29, 44, 53, 60, 62, 64, 71, 80, 83, 84, 92, 101, 104, 121, 123, 29, 132, 135, 156, 73, 78, 179, 182, 183, 184, 90, 191, 94, 202, 205, 208, 210, 216, 225, 238, 242, 260, 264, 267 269, 283, 284, 285, 289, 29 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 304, 305, 306, 307 309, 312, 313, 3 9, 323, 326, 329, 331.
Southwell, Rev. Robert, 79, 361, 368.
Spenser, 10, 15, 42, 57, 59, 108, 123, 180, 287, 356.
Sprat, Bishop, 7, 8, 9, 118, 156, 241.
Stael, Madame de, 152.
Stanhope, Lady Hester, 176.
Stebbing, Dr. H., 81.
Steele, Sir Richard, 63, 66, 80, 82, 160, 161, 174, 215, 221, 232, 233, 234, 247, 258, 259, 362, 364.
Stephania, Queen of Navarre, 64.
Sterne, Rev. Laurence, 43, 66, 168, 208, 213, 217, 221, 223, 228, 230, 232, 234, 240, 241, 243, 245, 257, 259, 262, 287, 357.
Stow, John, 46.
Strode, Dr. William, 156.
Stubbes, Phillip, 46, 132, 133, 144, 155, 173, 226, 272, 273.
Surrey, Earl of, 109.
Swift, Dean, 2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 15, 65, 82, 105, 120, 122, 153, 293.
Swinburne, Mr. A. C., 191.
Symes, Christofer, 174.
Tacitus, 98.
Talbot, Miss Catherine, 52, 176, 220, 221, 231.
Talbot, Mr. H. Fox, 157.
Talfourd, Sir T. N., 159.
Taylor, Mr. Isaac, 132, 174, 176, 185, 194.
Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 44, 128, 180.
Taylor, John, 21, 176, 221.
Taylor, Thomas, 55, 128, 157, 216.
Taylor, William, 43, 45, 60, 61, 69, 99, 121, 126, 131, 133, 135, 151, 173, 175, 177, 183, 185, 222, 283, 289, 301, 313, 315, 317, 367.
Teignmouth, Lord, 82, 216, 296.
Temple, Sir William, 14, 44, 119, 148, 160, 268.
Tennyson, Mr. Alfred, 78, 139.
Terry, Rev. Edward, 47, 161, 174.
Thackeray, Mr. W. M., 16, 54, 81, 82, 172, 274, f., 307, 331.
Thornton, Bonnel, 10, 80, 82, 156, 206, 211, 215, 217, 262, 264.
Thrale, Mrs. H. L., 176.
Thucydides, 265.
Tickell, Richard, 172.
Tillotson, Archbishop, 95.
Tilson, J., 43.
Todd, Archdeacon, 44, 46, 73, 74, 115, 120, 128, 129, 132, 133, 140, 143, 144, 160, 172, 176, 178, 215, 272, 283, 297, 298, 299, 301, 305, 317.
Todd, Dr. J. H., 49, 50.

Tooke, Rev. John Horne, 15, 183, 295, 335, 336.
Townley, Col. John, 105.
Trench, Archbishop, 44, 62, 63, 69, 131, 151, 172, 287, 292.
Tusser, Thomas, 207, 211, 229, 230, 233, 252, 272, 314.
Twisse, Dr. William, 215.
Udall, Rev. Nicholas, 64, 79, 108, 159, 162, 197, 224, 230, 249, 261, 264, 272, 312, 352, 355, 361, 362, 366, 367, 368.
Urquhart, Sir Thomas, 43, 117, 125, 132, 157, 186, 206, 226.
Vanbrugh, Sir John, 65, 206, 224, 259.
Vanbrugh and Colley Cibber, 156, 253, 259.
Vaugelas, C. F. de, 12.
Vernon, Rev. George, 115, 368.
Verstegan, Richard, 4, 6, 91, 111, 112, 183.
Viennet, M., 129.
Vincent, St., of Lerins, 39.
Virgil, 15.
Voltaire, 26, 28, 100.
Walker, John, 161.
Walpole, Horace, 13, 64, 122, 124, 132, 133, 168, 173, 176, 206, 209, 212, 225, 228, 239, 240, 254, 258, 262, 299, 309, 317, 357.
Warburton, Bishop, 43, 82, 83, 90, 134, 160, 166, 211, 212, 213, 215, 223, 246, 256, 299, 357.
Warton, Dr. Joseph, 246, 266.
Warton, Rev. Thomas, 116, 173, 252, 257.
Washington, George, 326.
Waterland, Dr. D., 115.
Watson, George, 230, 318.
Watson, Rev. William, 42, 63, 88, 111, 222, 361.
Watts, Dr. Isaac, 35, 43.
Webbe, William, 223, 242, 356.
Webster, Dr. Noah, 139, 140, 143, 175, 179, 221, 282, 283, 295, 298, 304.
Webster's Editors, Dr., 38, 49, 56, 132, 139, 143, 149, 158, 162, 166, 167, 176, 179, 185, 216, 221, 229, 242, 263, 272, 283, 284, 285, 298, 301, 307, 308, 309, 319.
Wesley, Rev. John, 48, 298.
Westcomb, Miss, 43.
Wey, M. Francis, 12, 100, 129, 153, 250, 263, 303, 315, 316.
Whately, Archbishop, 300, 304, 337.
Whetstones, George, 314.
Whewell, Dr. W., 132.
White, R., 132.
White, Mr. R. G., 36, 192, 193, f., 302, 303, 307, 316, 322, f., 362, f.
Whitlock, Dr. Richard, 272.
Whittier, Mr. J. G., 182.
Wicliffe, 49, 50, 73, 146, 159.
Wilberforce, Bishop, 48, 90, 290, 296, 329.
Wilkes, John, 82, 90, 128, 149, 214, 222, 223, 232, 235, 240, 244, 256, 268, 317, 318.
Wilkes, Miss, 53.
Wilkin, Mr. Simon, 46.
Wilkins, Bishop, 45, 89, 121.
Willes, Richarde, 108, 109.
William of Palerne, 358.
Wilson, Prof. H. H., 174.
Wilson, Burnaby & Co., 236.
Wiseman, Cardinal, 46.
Witherspoon, Dr. John, 136.
Worcester, Dr. Joseph E., 48, 49, 132, 133, 143, 156, 179, 216, 287, 296, 305, 307, 309, 313, 320, 322, 337.
Wordsworth, Bishop Christopher, 33, 298.
Wordsworth, W., 29, 68, 156, 178, 216, 306, 307.
Wraxall, Sir N. W., 306.
Wright, Mr. Thomas, 313.
Wright, Mr. W. Aldis, 353.
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, 109.
Young, Dr. Edward, 236.

INDEX OF BOOKS, ETC.

Abel Redevivus, 223.
Anturs of Arther, The, 353.
Apology for Lollard Doctrines, 159.
Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register, &c., The, 198.
Bible, authorized version of the, 162, 252, 307, 352, 353, 355, 356, 362.
Bible, Geneva, 332, 352, 361.
British Critic, The, 298.
Cardinalismo di Santa Chiesa, Il (translated by G. H.), 44, 63, 190, 222.
Cruel Assault of Gods Fort, The, 206.
Discoveries of the World, The, 268.
Dorset Glossary, The, 279.
Early English Alliterative Poems, 353.
Edinburgh Review, The, 72, 116, 128, 286, 293, 313.
Eikon Basilike, 114.
Eulogium, 107.
Felon Sowe, The, &c., 59.
Francion, The Comical History of, 87, 111, 190, 212, 223, 232, 250, 265, 356, 360.
French Academie, The, Part I (ed. 1589), 67, 70, 133, 156, 355, 366.
Giles's Trip to London, 81, 220, 243.
Guardian, The, newspaper, 142.
Humours of Whist, The, 223, 244.
Hurlothrumbo, 113.
Letters of Junius, 67, 222, 225, 238, 244, 249, 254, 258, 269.
Literary Churchman, The, 108, 131.
London Review, The, 280.
Maroccus Extaticus, 249.
Mede, The Life of Joseph, 128.
Nation, The, 323, 344.
Naturall and Experimentall History of Winds, &c., The (1653), translated by R. G., 93, 128, 132, 189.
Newes out of Purgatorie, 254.
Nipotismo di Roma, Il, Translation of, 43, 80.
North American Review, The, 322.
Notes and Queries, 48, 315.
Of the Olde God and the Newe, 226, 361.
Pall Mall Budget, The, 72.
Pall Mall Gazette, The, 168.
Pasquine in a Traunce, 226, 332.
Paul, The Life of . . Father, 133.
Percy's Folio MS., Bp., 358.
Praier and Complaynte, &c., The, 108.
Primer, Henry the Eight's, 167.
Promptorium Parvulorum, 287.
Public Opinion, 321.
Quarterly Review, The, 105, 297.
Questions of Profitable and Pleasant Concernings, 58, 79, 223, 272, 352, 356.
Remarks on the 'Life of Mr. Milton', &c. 66.
Robin Good-fellow His Mad Prankes and Merry Jests, 336.
Saturday Review, The, 45, 194, 274.
Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, The, 121.
Sir Amadace, 59.
Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight, 65.
State Papers, 356.
Stella Clericorum, 50.
Tarlton's Jests, &c., 172, 212, 273, 336.
Times, The, newspaper, 158, 293.
Westminster Review, The, 108.
World of Wonders, A, translated by R. C., 106, 112, 123, 232, 272, 304.

INDEX OF WORDS AND PHRASES.

*** Many terms adduced in this book are not here indexed. Groups of such, generally arranged in alphabetical order, will be found at pp. 21, 22, 37, 38, 60, 61, 75, 100, 103, 104, 106, 108—110, 112, 114, 116, 120, 123, 127, 139, 141, 142, 149, 152, 158—163, 169, 174, 176, 182, 185—188, 194, 205, 206, 295, 297, 299, 301, 305, 311—314, 319, 320, 360.

A, misuses of, 209.
A-preparing, was, &c., 332, 333.
Abandon, v. a., 131.
Abandonment, 131, 311.
Abhominable, 158, f.
Abhominal, 159.
Ability, old use of, 210.
Abiogenesia, &c., 295.
Abiogenesis, &c., 295.
Able, der. of, 162.
Abomino, 159.
Abruption, 203.
Acclivitous, 176, 185.
Accommodate, 106.
Accommodation, 105, 106.
According as, 142.
Accredit, 283, f.
Accuse, for blame, 210.
Accustomed, for frequented, 210, 276.
Act, v. a., for do, 203.
Act, for actuate, 166.
Activer, v. a., 129.
Adamantiferous, 177.
Adjectival, 141, 318, 367.
Adjectivial, 176.
Admire, for wonder, &c., 210, 265.
Admittible, 176.
Adulate, 172, 299.
Adulatory, 286, 367.
Advertise, for inform, 266.
Advertisement, 127.
Advocate, v. a., 276, 285, 300.
Advocate, v. n., 285.
Aerolite, 158.
Æsthetic, 126.
Affixal, 318.
Againsaw, 165.
Age, v. n., 285.
Aggressive, 275, 314.
Agree, for settle, 210.
Agree to, for fit, 210.
Agressif, 314.
Aid, der. of, 163.
Akmé, 302.
Alert, alertness, 120.
Aliant, &c., 162.
Alien, 117.
All, for all the, 205.
All along of, &c., 211.
All and all, 210.
All as ever, 203, 210.
All one, for nevertheless, 210.
All that ever, 210.
All the same, for nevertheless, 275.
Allay, for alloy, 266.
Alluvious, 319.
Alms, der. of, 163.
Alone, for only, &c., 46, f., 246.
Alonely, 188.
Alt, 187, 211.
Altitudes, 187, 211, 368.
Amalgamize, 174.
Ambage, 110, 254.
Ambassador, 120.
Ample, 119.
An end, 211.
Anachronic, &c., 315.
Anachronous, 314, f.
Analogie, 4.
Analogon, 302.
Analogue, 302.
Analyse, v. a., 174, 175.
Analyse, sb., 174.
Analyser, 174.
Analysis, 174.
Analysize, 174.
Analyze, 158, 175.
Anastomose, 174, 175, 295.
Anastomosis, 174.
Anastomosize, 174.
Anathemize, 176.
Ancestorial, 132.
Ancestorially, 132.
Anchylose, 295.
Ancient, 158, 161.
Ancylose, 295.
Ancylosize, 295.
Andirons, 130.
Anent, 104.
Anguished, 71, f.
Anklet, 157.

Ankylose, 295.
Another from and to, 82.
Anotherguess, 212.
Antecedent, 303.
Antécédent, 303.
Antecedents, 302, f.
Anthropomorphize, 368.
Antic, 166.
Antipatriotic, 317.
Antiquarian, sb., 306.
Antique, 103, 166.
Antiques, for ancients, 108.
Any, uses of, 196.
Anywhere than, 82.
Apoplectic balsam, 127.
Apostate, v. n., 169.
Appeach, v. a., 248.
Appendical, &c., 185.
Appendicatory, 185.
Appendixious, 185.
Appetize, 132, 297.
Appliance, 307.
Apply, v. n., 123, 124.
Appreciant, 315.
Appreciate, v. a., 288.
Appreciation, 288.
Appreciative, 315.
Appreciatory, 315.
Apprehension, 111.
Appropriated, for appropriate, 212.
Approve, for prove, 267.
Arbalist, 175.
Aristarchy, 143.
Aristocrat, 288.
Aristocrate, 305.
Aristocratic, sb., 288.
Armlet, 144, 157.
Arrangements, 121.
Artificial, 166.
Artilize, 178.
Artize, 178.
As, misuses of, 199, 213.
As, omitted, 212.
As, superfluous, 212, 213.
As how, for that, 213.
As now, for now, 213.
As that, bad use of, 213.
As this day, for on this day, 212.
As to-morrow, 203, 212.
As who, for who, 213.
Ascertain, for determine, &c., 213, 214, 297.
Ash, ashes, 132.
Asparagus, 161.
Assai, 54.
Assassin, 4.
Assay, for essay, 266.
Assez, 54.
Assist, for be present, 292.
Assubtiling, 110.
Assumptiousness, 318
At, for after, 214.
At, for in, 235.
At full, for in full, 214.
At the long run, 214.
At unawares, 214.
Atrabilarious, 132.
Atrabilious, 132.
Attach, v.n., 142, 275, 283.
Attainder, 121.
Attitudinarian, 312.
Audacious, 110.
Authenticate, v. a., 116, 132.
Authenticate, part. adj., 132.
Authoress, 122, 187, 188.
Authress, 187.
Avant-peau, 112.
Averse from & to, 83.
Avocation, misuse of, 214, f.
Avocations, 214, f.
Away, to do, 267.
Away with, can't, 203, 216.
Axial, 175.
Azymes, 112.
Bad, for ill, 104, 217.
Balm, der. of, 163.
Bam, v. a., 217.
Bam, sb., 217.
Bank, v. n., 299.
Banter, 120.
Barbarious, 160.
Base, v. a., 288.
Bastile, 162, 367.
Battalion, 120.
Bawdry, for bawds, 312.
Be to seek, to, 217.
Because, for in order that, 203, 217.
Bedsister, 165.
Beetling, 125.
Begun, for began, 104, 207.
Behest, 108.
Being battered, was, &c., 274, 283, 284, 294, 321, f.
Being doing, 351.
Being gaping, &c., 336, 337.
Being in fieri, 351.
Being, is, 340.
Belongings, 307.
Belovedest, 189.
Bemean, v. a., 293.
Benevolence, 117.
Benevolist, 176.
Berth, 128.
Beseeched, 139, 206.
Beseechinglike, 166.
Bespoke, for bespoken, 207.
Bestowal, 303.
Bestowment, 303.
Bestraughted, 361.
Betrayal, 304.
Betrayment, 304.
Better, for more, 104.
Better cheap, 217.
Better worth, for worth more, 217.
Bibliophile, 175.
Bibliophilist, 175.
Blame, der. of, 163, 309.
Blesseder, 189.

Blood, for bleed, 217.
Blowed, 139, 206.
Blueth, 173.
Body-spirit, 183.
Bombast, adj., 256.
Both, uses of, 196, 197, 200.
Bottom, for ball of thread, 217.
Borachio, 217.
Borealian, 100.
Borracho, 217.
Bounce, v. n., for lie, 218.
Bridal, der. of, 157.
Bridemaid, 218.
Broke, for broken, 104, 207.
Brumal, 128.
Bubble, v. a. for dupe, 218.
Bubble, sb., for dupe, 218.
Bumpsie, adj., 273.
Burstness, 165.
Busto, 266.
But now, for just now, 218.
But I, for but me, &c., 104, 303.
Buxom, for wanton, 218.
By, for from, 267.
By, for on, 204.
By and by, 166.
Cab, der. of, 162, 187.
Cable, v. a., 300.
Cank, v. n., 219.
Cannon, 166.
Cannonade, 120.
Capitalist, 311.
Capitalize, 194.
Captivate, for capture, 219.
Caricatura, 266.
Caricature, v. a., 301.
Carriage, 166.
Carriwitchet, 219, 368.
Cartel, 120.
Casual, sb., 305.
Catched, 139, 206.
Cates, der. of, 162.
Causativity, 308.
Cede, 275.
Celebrity, new use of, 304.
Cense, sb., 313.
Censorial, 110, 319.
Census, 313.
Cent, der. of, 162, 163.
Centenarian, 304, f.
Centenary, sb., senses of, 304, f., 368.
Century, old sense of, 305.
Cephalomant, 26.
Cereal, sb., 305.
Chagrin, 120.
Chamber, for bedroom, 203, 219.
Chapman, 219.
Chargeable, for costly, 219.
Chark, for char, 204.
Cheapen, for ask the price of, 166, 219.
Cherubim, a, 104.
Chian, sb. and adj., 219.
Chieftain, 108.
Chin-cough, 219.
Chink, for fit, 220.
Chiromantist, 26.
Chirosopher, 179.
Chirosophist, 179.
Choose, for wish, 220.
Chopping, adj., 220.
Chose, for chosen, 104, 139, 208.
Chum, 129.
Churchgoing - bell, 348.
Churchman, for ecclesiastic, 220.
Circumcision, 362.
Circumvallation, 120.
Cit, 187.
Civility, for civilization, 166, 172, 220.
Civilizade, 177.
Civilization, 173, 275, 312.
Clad, for clothe, 59.
Classify, 299.
Clem, v. a., 280, 281.
Clever, for convenient, &c., 220, 221.
Clime, 366.
Clumsy, 106.
Cock of the game, for game-cock, 221.
Cockroach, der. of, 128.
Coddle, v. a., 221.
Codify, 301, 317.
Coevality, 60.
Collaborator, 184.
Collection, 167.
Collocution, 367.
Colloquist, 311.
Colloquize, 194.
Combustion, for tumult, 221.
Commandant, 120.
Commence, misuse of, 215.
Comment, v. a., 205.
Commentation, 132.
Commentitious, 117.
Commit one's self, to, 283.
Commode, for bawd, 221.
Commode, adj., 221.
Commodity, 167.
Commonsenseadox, 26.
Communicate, strange use of, 204.
Communionable, 176.
Compage, 254.
Comparison of, in, 94.
Compassionate, for pitiable, 221.
Compassionate, for one who pities, 222.
Compassionevole, 221.
Compatible, 110.
Compendious, 109.
Compete, 172, 287.
Competitive, 287.

Complement, 106.
Complex, sb., 307.
Complexion, &c., old use of, 167, 222.
Compliance to, in, 95.
Complimental, 222, 283.
Complimentary, 283.
Composure, old uses of, 204.
Compoune, for compound, 361.
Concede, 114, 117.
Concision, 362.
Condensity, 152.
Condole, v. a., 222.
Condone, 299.
Conduct, sb., old use of, 222.
Confident, adj., old use of, 283
Confidential, 283, 284.
Conformance, 173.
Conging, 189.
Conglutinate, 367.
Congratulate, old use of, 222.
Conscious, 105, 106.
Conservative, sb., 130.
Considerable, for important, 267.
Consonant, 111.
Conspicuity, 222.
Constate, v. a., 180, 181.
Contaminate, 110, 111, 367.
Contemporary to, 87.
Contemptible, for contemptuous, 168, 222, f.
Contemptuous, for contemptible, 223.
Continuator, 173.
Contrary from and than, 82.
Convalesce, 287.
Conventical, adj., 177.
Conversation, 166.
Copy, various old senses of, 223.
Copy of verses, a, 267.
Coquet, adj., 256.
Cormorant, 161.
Cornice, 119.
Corps, 120.
Correction, for correctness, 204.
Cotemporary, 118, 306.
Count on, to, 43.
Countryship, 6.
Coxy, der. of, 272.
Coy, der. of, 163.
Crack a whip, to, 283.
Crass, &c., 128.
Credit, v. a., old use of, 283, f.
Creolian, adj. & sb., 223.
Crescentade, 177.
Crestomachy, 309.
Criminate, 298.
Criticality, 103.
Criticize upon, to, 273.
Cross, for opposite, 224.
Cuckoldly, adj., 224.
Cucumer, 119.
Cuff, sb., 224.
Culminate, 119.
Cult, 172.
Currant, 161.
Curriculus, 309.
Curring, 189.
Curtail, der. of, 185.
Curtal, adj., 185.
Curtal-axe, der. of, 185.
Cushion, old use of, 224.
Custodian, 304.
Cut a person, to, 283.
Cuticle, 117.
Dagger, 161.
Damageable, for detrimental, 224.
Damp, 106.
Dare, pres. and pret., 229, f.
Dead-born, 292.
Dealtaking, 165.
Dearworth, 165.
Deballate, v. a., 103.
Deblaterate, 138.
Decade, for ten years, 304.
Décade, for ten days, 304.
Declamator, 173.
Declamatory, 110.
Declination, 109.
Decompose, 288.
Decompound, for decompose, 224.
Deducate, v. a., 181, 182.
Deduct, for deduce, 104.
Defendant, for defender, 224.
Defendress, 188.
Deferential, 315.
Defial, 173.
Defile, 120.
Defunct, 106.
Degradation, for subgradation, 171.
Dehort, v. a., 227.
Deific, 157.
Delineation, 109.
Delinquishment, 367.
Demagogues, 114.
Demand, for ask, 224, f.
Demand, sb. for question, 225.
Demarcate, 298.
Demarcation, 288, 298.
Demark, 298.
Dement, part., 292.
Deminuere, 295.
Democrat, 288, f.
Démocrate, 288, 305.
Democratic, sb., 288, 368.
Democratical, adj., 292.
Democratical, sb., 288.
Democratist, 288.
Demonstration, 111.
Démoralisation, 43.

Demoralize, 295, 297.
Denominationalism, 44.
Denunciate, 132.
Deny, old uses of, 225.
Depalmate, 138.
Depauperize, misuse of, 295.
Deploy, 301.
Dereliction, old use of, 225.
Desert, 108.
Design for, old phrase 236.
Desirable, 167.
Desirous, 166.
Despecificate, 168.
Despicable, 108.
Destiny, v. a., 186.
Destructive, 108.
Desynonymize, 168.
Detainal, 173.
Deteriorate, 288.
Devilry, 132, 367.
Devotion, old use of, 225.
Dia, false etymology of, 64.
Diabolus, ridiculously etymologized, 50.
Diagnose, 174, 175, 295.
Diagnoser, v. a., 174.
Diagnosis, 174.
Diagnosize, 174.
Dialectal, 167.
Diamondiferous, 177.
Diction, 109, 366, f.
Differ with, &c., 82.
Difference than and to, 82.
Different than, 82.
Different to, 77, f., 276, 362, f., 366.
Differente a, 83.
Difficilement, 190.
Difficilitate, v. a., 184.
Difficilmente, 190.
Difficultate, v. a., 299.
Difficultly, 189.
Digged, 207.
Dilapidate, v. n., 204.
Diligence, for coach, 238.
Dilly, for diligence, 238.
Dime, der. of, 163.
Dimension, 109.
Diminutival, 318.
Diplomacy, 313.
Diplomate, 305.
Diplomatist, 305.
Diplomatize, 194.
Directly, for as soon as, 275, 292.
Dirge, der. of, 163.
Disacquaintance, 110.
Disadvise, v. a., 225.
Disagree from and to, &c., 82, 366.
Disannul, 292.
Disclamatory, 26.
Disconsolation, 367.
Discordant from and to, 83.
Discourse, v. a., 225.
Discover, for reveal, &c., 267, f.
Discovery, for exploration, 268.
Disculpate, v. a., 119.
Disendow, 301.
Disestablish, 301.
Disestablishment, 301.
Disfurnish, v. a., 225.
Dish of tea, 225.
Dishabilitate, 299.
Disingenuity, 225.
Dislogistic, 308, f.
Disnatured, 225.
Disorganize, 288.
Dispend, for expend, 368.
Dispense, for exempt, &c., 263, f.
Dispense, old uses of, 226, 368.
Dispense with, old uses of, 226, 263, f.
Disputative, 110.
Disserviceable, 227.
Dissimilar from and to, 83.
Dissuade, old use of, 227.
Dissyllable, adj., 227.
Distemperature, 227.
Distinguished, for marked, 227.
Ditionaries, 108.
Divert, v. n., 227.
Divest, 158.
Divinesse, 189.
Do, v. n., for contrive, 227.
Do away, v. a., 250, 267, 281.
Do away with, to, 281, 284.
Doctrinaire, 312.
Doctrinarian, sb., 312.
Document, v. a., 227.
Documentation, 227.
Documentize, v. a., 227.
Domestical, sb., 368.
Dominant, 319.
Dominator, 108.
Done up, for tired out, 283.
Doubt, v. n., for suspect, 228.
Douceur, old use of, 228.
Dowlas, 228.
Dowry, der. of, 163.
Doxy, der. of, 272.
Drank, for drunk, 292.
Dreadful, 167.
Dress, v. a., old use of, 228.
Dricksie, 273.
Dromidote, 110.
Dropsy, der. of, 162.
Drove, for driven, 139, 208.
Drownd, v., 361.
Drownded, 59.
Dry, for thirsty, 228.
Dunstical, 261.
Durst, pres. tense, 228, f.
Dwindle, sb., 198, 201.

Dying bed, 127.
Dynameter, 175.
Dynamometer, 175.
Dyslogistic, 308, f.
Dyspepsy, 183.
Each, for every, 229.
Each, with plu., 199.
Each other time, 203, 230.
Each other week, 230.
Eat, for ate, 207.
Economiser, 297.
Economist, 311.
Economize, 297.
Edit, 299.
Educationable, 176.
Educational, 131, f., 286.
Effete, 319.
Effigy, der. of, 254.
Egregious, 110.
Egregious, old use of, 204.
Elate, v. a., 42.
Elope, for escape, 268.
Elopement, old use of, 268.
Emancipist, 176.
Embarrass, sb., 230.
Embowel, 292.
Emigrant, 312.
Emigrate, 283.
Eminent, for imminent, 159.
Emphasize, 174, 295.
Empirical, 126.
Enactment, 283.
Encyclopædy, 183.
Endeavour, v. a., 204.
Enfans, for enfants, 162, 367.
Engineer, v. a., 301.
Enhunger, 193, 194.
Enjoy death, to, &c., 202.
Enlarge, for liberate, 268.
Enlightenment, 305.
Enmious, 287.
Enormious, 160, 289.
Entalenten, v. a., 65.
Entirety, 43, 285, f.
Epitaphie, &c., 366.
Epitomator, 173.
Equal with, 303.
Equalitarian, 22, 312.
Equator, 120.
Equip, 112.
Equivalent with, 87.
Equivoque, 120.
Ere, misuse of, 292.
Ergonist, 110.
Eschew, 123.
Esperer, a use of, 262, f.
Essay, for assay, 266.
Esse, 335, 343.
Essere, 342, 343.
Establishmentarianism, 44.
Evaporize, 174.
Eventual, 288.
Ever now and then, 230.
Every other while, 230.
Examinator, 173.
Exampless, adj., 189.
Excepting, 40.
Exceptionable, misuse of, 201.
Exceptional, 201, 315.
Exceptive, 315.
Excurse, v. a. and n., 297.
Excursion, v. n., 297.
Excursionist, 297, 311.
Excursionize, 194, 297.
Executive, sb., 305.
Exhaustive, 127.
Exigent, sb., 170.
Exist, 335, f., 342.
Existence, 336.
Existere, 335.
Expect, v. n., for wait, 230.
Expectative, sb., 119.
Expediential, 316.
Experiential, 132, 286.
Experientially, 132.
Expert, sb., 305.
Exposition, for aspect, 204.
Expostulate, v. a., 230.
Expoune, for expound, 361.
Expressive, misuse of, 173.
Extra, sb., 163.
Extravagant, 111.
Fabulous, for incredible, 130.
Facsimile, v. a., 301.
Facsimilist, 311.
Facticide, 26.
Family, 166.
Famoust, 189.
Fanatics, 116.
Father-land, 44.
Feeling, sb., 122.
Felicitously, 76, f.
Fence, der. of, 162.
Ferriery, 119.
Feruler, 161.
Feveret, &c., sb., 231.
Fiercelier, 188.
Figurative, 109.
Financial, 173, 315.
Financier, 286, 315.
Finesse, for fineness, 189.
Fishing-rod, 348.
Fixture, 130, 313.
Fixure, 130, 313.
Flagitious, 117.
Flea, for flay, 160.
Flesher, for butcher, 292.
Fleshhood, 165.
Flimsy, 273.
Float, v. a., for flood, 231.
Florentine, sb., 231.
Flush, adj., old use of, 231.
Flux, adj., 204.
Fob, v. a., 231.
Fogo, 127.
Foible, 120.
Fond, old uses of, 231.
Foolish-fire, 183.

Footfast, 166.
For, old uses of, 268.
For, for from, 231.
For, ellipsis of, 271.
Foray, 307.
Fore, to the, 307.
Fore-elder, sb., 6.
Forego, 158.
Foreign from and to, 83.
Formuler, v. a., 129.
Forsook, for forsaken, 139, 208.
Forth, 123.
Fortnightly, adj., 319, f.
Fouly, 188.
Fountain, 366.
Four, on all, 211.
Fracas, 127.
Franchise, 305.
Fraught, for freight, 59.
Fridge, v. a., 232.
Frightful, for timid, 232.
Frightfully, misuse of, 199.
From, for to, 232.
From, ellipsis of, 232.
Frontispiece, 158.
Frontispiece, old uses of, 232.
Frugality, 108, 366.
Fuldo, v. a., 6.
Fumette, 233.
Function, 109.
Futile, 166.
Futurely, 188.
Gadsi, 273.
Garotte, 313.
Garran, 233.
Gasconade, 120.
Gaud, 123.
Geldhood, 166.
Gender, 161.
General, 166.
Genteel, old use of, 233.
Geography, 366.
Get by, for overreach, 203, 233.
Gifted, 72.
Gigmanity, 19.
Gilt, for gild, 361.
Gird, girt, 59.
Girdlestead, 165.
Gloomth, 176.
Godlike-wise, 176.
Gouvernante, 269.
Governess, 188.
Governor, 175.
Gown, 107.
Gownd, for gown, 361.
Grade, 129, 288.
Graff, graft, 59.
Grain, in, 126.
Grandchild, 113.
Grandiloquent, 319.
Grandiose, 289.
Grandioso, 289.
Grandity, 61.
Gratefulness, 172.
Great, by the, 233.
Greenth, 173.
Grimace, 120.
Griskin, 233.
Grog, 128.
Groundstaddleness, 166.
Group, 119.
Grow, v. a., 282.
Gruntle, der. of, 272.
Gully, 128.
H omitted, &c., 358.
Habitat, 162.
Hæmatemesia, &c., 295.
Hæmatemesis, 295.
Halfly, 58.
Hand, at the best, 233.
Happen on, to, &c., 190.
Harass, sb., 292.
Hardiness, 269.
Harlot, adj., 256.
Harmonical, 109.
He, for it, 353.
Head, of its own, &c., 203, 233, f.
Headlongly, 188.
Hearing, 108.
Heart-rending, 124.
Heathenry, 133, 312.
Heathnical, 155.
Heliatic, 368.
Helpmate, 156.
Helpmeet, 156, 367.
Hen-egg, 204.
Her, for 's, 355, f.
Hermaphrodite, 110.
Hery, heryinge, 108.
Him, for he, 199.
Him, for it, 352, 353.
Hind, sb., 234.
Hippodonomia, 175.
His, for its, 352.
His, for 's, 355, f.
His self, 352.
Hist, for hiss, 119.
Hit, for it, 352.
Hit, for its, 353.
Hogo, &c., 127.
Hoise, hoist, 59.
Holocausts, 112, 114.
Homicide, 108.
Homœosemant, 172.
Homograph, 170.
Homologon, 302.
Homologue, 302.
Homophone, 170.
Homotaxia, &c., 295.
Homotaxis, 295.
Honeyed, &c., 70.
Hospitability, 186.
Hospital, adj., 187.
Huggle, der. of, 272.
Human, 166.
Humanitaire, 316.
Humanitarian, adj., 316.
Humanitian, 111.
Humile, v. a., 133.
Humiliate, 133, 276.
Humiliating, 367.
Hungarian, 112.
Hunger-starve, v. a., 281.
Hydroprêtre, 175.
Hypostatize, 368.
Idea, 105.
Idelly, 188.
Identification, 312.
Identify, 299.
Identity, 312.

Ideographic, 368.
Ideolatry, 368.
Ideology, 180, 288.
Idiom, 109, 117, 118.
Idiom, defin. of, 342.
Idiotism, 118.
Idlely, 188.
Idlesby, 272, 273.
Idolatry, 163.
If, ellipsis of, 234.
Ignomy, 176.
Ignore, 118, 166, 301.
Ill, for bad, 234.
Illiterature, 22, 313.
Illucidate, 159.
Illudius, 354.
Illustricity, 176.
Illustrious, 289.
Imbibed, 108.
Immediately, for as soon as, 275.
Immerge, v. a., 234.
Immigrant, 283.
Impartation, 176.
Imperatival, 318.
Imperial, for imperious, 276.
Imperish, 367.
Impersonal, 102.
Impertinence, old use of, 269.
Impertinent, old use of, 269.
Importable, 167.
Importunacy, 234.
Impossibilification, 184.
Impossibilitate, v. a., 184.
Impress, for impressment, 204.
Impression, 109.
Imprision, sb., 367.
Improvisation, 312.
Improvise, 301.
Impugn, 62.
Impulsive, sb., 169.
Imson, sb., 182.
In, for on, 235.
In, now superfluous, 235.
In, ellipsis of, 269.
In course, for of course, 234.
Inadmissible, 319.
Inaptitude, 305, f.
Incongruent, 367.
Incontinently, 80.
Incubus, 106.
Incuriosity, 43, 114.
Incurious, 44, 114.
Incuriously, 44.
Incuriousness, 44.
Independent from, &c., 87, 362, f.
Independently of, 94.
Indifferent to, 362.
Indignity, 109.
Indulge, for allow, 235, f.
Indulgence, v. a., 292.
Industrial, 288, 316.
Industry, 107.
Inept, 306.
Ineptitude, 305, f.
Inerme, 176.
Infallibilist, 301.
Infamize, 133.
Infamizer, 133.
Infantry, 113.
Inferential, 284.
Infinitely, 292, f.
Inflate, 106.
Influencive, &c., 286, f.
Influential, &c., 276, 286, f.
Inform, old use of, 236.
Infuriate, adj., 123.
Ingenious, 111.
Ingenuity, misuse of, 204.
Ingredient into, 87.
Inhabit, v. n., 236.
Inhabitable, 167.
Inimical, 140, 286, f.
Inimicitious, 287.
Inimicous, 287.
Injury, v. a., 186.
Ink, der. of, 163.
Innovate, v. a., 204.
Insane asylum, 127.
Inseparable to, 82.
Insolens, 168.
Instantly, for as soon as, 275.
Instructess, 187.
Insularity, 306.
Insuppressive, 173.
I'n't, 203, 236.
Intellect, 107.
Intend, v. a., old use of, 236.
Intend for, old phrase, 236.
Intensate, 299.
Intensify, 301.
Intensive, 126.
Interchangeable, old use of, 236.
Interest of, in the, 276.
Interfuse, 110.
Intermutual, &c., 242.
International, 19, 173, 316, f.
Inter-repellent, 317.
Interrogate, 111.
Interview, v. a., 300.
Intimado, sb., 236.
Intiment, 162.
Into, for to, 236.
Intreatable, 167.
Invalid, 127.
Inveigle, 109.
Investigable, 167.
Inveterably, 176.
Inveterate, 35.
Inwit, 165.
Irreductibility, 181.
Irrespectively of, 94.
Is, for his, 358, 359.
Is, for 's, 358, 359.
Isolate, 298.
It, for its, 352, 353.
It is these, 40, f.
Itinerate, v. n., 111, 298.
Its, age of, 353, 354.
Jakes, 80.
Jemmy, sb., 237.
Jeopard, jeopardy, 122.
Jewellery, 312.

Jim-whiskee, 257.
Joseph, sb., 237.
Jouir, misuse of, 202.
Jumps, sb., 237.
Jungle, 306.
Junkery, for junkets, 312.
Junquetry, 312.
Jut, sb., for push, 237.
Juxtapose, v. a., 334.
Kayan, sb., 219.
Kennel, for gutter, 237.
Kerchief, 157.
Kicksy-wicksy, der. of, 272.
Kindly, 166.
Kinswoman, 122.
Knowable, 297.
Knowing, old use of, 269.
Kypsey, 273.
Lady, for wife, 237.
Lambs'-wool, 237.
Lamentablely, 188.
Lancent, 162.
Landscape, 158.
Largeity, 61.
Latrina, 187.
Lay, sb., 237.
Leadinglike, 166.
Leaf of a hat, 237.
Learned book, 168.
Leasing, for gleaning, 237.
Leggings, 128.
Lengthy, 56.
Lenience, 315.
Lewdsby, 272.
Liberal, sb., &c., 296.
Liberalize, 296.
Lie, for lodge, 203, 238.
Lief, 203, 238.
Lieve, 238.
Lightning, 163.
Like, had, 269.
Limp, adj., 320.
Limpsy, 273.
Linguacious, 183.
Linsey, 273.
Literate, sb., 184.
Literato, 184.
Literator, 184.
Litherbie, 272.
Livelihood, &c., 155, 367.
Livelong, 126.
Loathsome, 167.
Locate, 172, 282.
Locution, 306.
Long of, 211.
Longsome, 56.
Look, v. a., 205.
Loseness, 166.
Ludicrous talent, 127.
Lurcher, for lurker, 238.
Lutestring, to speak in, 238.
Lyingness, 189.
Macaroni, for fop, 238.
Machine, for coach, 238.
Machines, for machinery, 239.
Mad doctor, 127.
Magistratical, 185.
Magnanimity, 107, 108.
Magnetist, 311.
Magnetize, 288.
Mails, old use of, 269.
Main, adv., 203, 239.
Make-belief, 292.
Makeshift, senses of, 313, f.
Malapert, 239.
Malinger, 301.
Maltalent, 65.
Manage, sb., 169.
Manifform, 26.
Manipular, 101.
Mannerism, 311.
Mannerist, 311.
Mansuetude, 107, 110.
Manufactural, 45.
Many, a pretty, 239, 276.
Marauding, 120.
Margent, 161.
Material, sb., 306, f.
Matériel, 307.
Matter, v. a., 239.
Maturity, 107.
Maximize, 297, 317.
Mazard, 239.
Me, for I, 199.
Meanly, 167.
Meanly, misuse of, 199.
Meat, old use of, 205.
Mediocrity, new use of, 304.
Medium, for average, 239.
Meed, 123.
Meet-help, 156.
Meet helper, 156.
Melancholiac, 26.
Memorialize, 171, 297.
Menagery, 182.
Mercy, der. of, 163.
Messager, 161.
Metalline, 239.
Metamorphize, 174.
Metamorphose, 174.
Métamorphoser, 174.
Metamorphosize, 174.
Method, 109.
Methodical, 109.
Metrical, 109.
Midst, in our, 48, f.
Migrant, sb., 313.
Migrate, 299.
Militate, 285, 345.
Millennial, 128.
Millionaire, 183.
Millionist, 22, 183, 312.
Minimize, 297, 317.
Minutiose, 168.
Miscellaneous author, 127.
Miscellany, adj., 239.
Miscreate, miscreated, 42.
Misnomered, 195.
Missile, misuse of, 171, 293.
Mistress, old use of, 240.

Miswent, have, 360.
Mob, der. of, 163, 187.
Mobile, for mob, 240.
Mockado, 240.
Modesty, 107.
Molasses, 128.
Molotto, 113.
Monetary, 288.
Monograph, 307.
Monomial, 175.
Mononomial, 175.
Monosyllable, adj., 227.
Monstruous, 160, 289.
Mopsy, 273.
Morbific, 157.
More but, 82.
Mort, 203, 240.
Mosquito, 112.
Most an end, 211.
Mountain, a beverage, 240.
Mountainous, old use of, 205.
Much beneficial, &c., 55.
Mulata, 112.
Mumpsimus, 137.
Musquetade, 120.
Mussel, 166.
Mutining, 189, 240.
Mutton, for sheep, 240.
Mutual, old uses of, 240, f., 368.
Mutual, for alternate, &c., 242.
Mutual friend, 26, 241, f.
Myriad, 113.
Mystify, v. a., 129.
Naivety, 182.
Narrate, 121, 172, 275, 287.
Nation, for great deal, 243.
Naturalist, old sense of, 309.
Naturalistic, 309.
Naturian, 111.
Near, for stingy, 203, 243.
Neck-handkerchief, 157.
Nécromant, 26.
Nefast, 100.
Negoce, 117, 180.
Negra, 113, 114.
Neighbour, adj., 256.
Neighbour, v. a., 243.
Neither, for either, 243.
Neither .. nor .. are, &c., 199, 292.
Néologie, 179.
Néologisme, 179.
Neoterism, 19.
Nephew, 113.
Never, for ever, 270.
Nextly, 58.
Night-rail, 243.
Nine, to the, 26.
Nobiliary, 317.
Noddle, v. a., 243.
Nominatival, 318.
Nonagenarian, 304.
None, uses of, 196.
Norm, 133.
Notability, for notable person, 304.
Noteworthy, 317.
Notice, v. a., 285.
Noticeable, 173, 285.
Notoriety, new use of, 304.
Notwithstanding, misuse of, 292.
Novel, sb., 133.
Novelet, 133.
Number .. were, 199.
Numerosity, 110.
Numerous, 109.
Numerous, old uses of, 243, f.
Objective, 126.
Objectivity, 308.
Oblivionize, 367.
Obnoxious, for liable, 270.
Obscure, 109, 111.
Obsequious, 108.
Observation, for observance, 292.
Obtainal, 173.
Obtundity, 176.
Obviate, 111.
Occasional, old use of, 270.
Occasionally, old use of, 270.
Occurrent, sb., 170.
October, for cider, 244.
Octogenarian, 304.
Of, old uses of, 205, 244, f.
Of, for at, &c., 87.
Of, superfluous, 270.
Of, ellipsis of, 270, f.
Offspring, for origin, 6.
Oftenly, 58.
Oil, der. of, 163.
Olden, v., 275.
Omnibus, sb., 254.
Omniscian, 112.
On losing, was, 332.
On, for of, 245.
On, for to, 246.
On the long run, 292.
On to, prep., 276.
Onliest, 246.
Onlight, 165.
Only, for mere, &c., 47.
Only, odd use of, 246.
Only, misplacement of, 200.
Only, misuse of, 200.
Open, sb., 305.
Operative, sb., 314.
Oppidant, 162.
Opposite from, 82.
Optimist, 311.
Optimize, 194.
Or, with plu., 199.
Oratorial, 246.
Original, for origin, 271.
Originate, 298.
Orphant, 162.
Orthopædic, 158.
Otacust, 113.
Outbreathed, 246.
Outlander, 6.
Outling, 165.

Outlook, 121.
Out-of-fashioned, 246
Outtake, prep., 165.
Outtalented, 72.
Outwending, 165.
Overthrowed, 207.
Pair, old uses of, 246, f.
Palate, v. a., for taste, 247.
Palisado, 120.
Palsy, der. of, 163.
Pander, 158.
Pantisocrat, 289.
Pantisocratist, 289.
Papalin, 247.
Papish, sb., 247.
Paralleless, adj., 189.
Parulyse, v. a., 174, 175, 288.
Paralyse, sb., 175.
Paralyser, v. a., 174.
Paralysie, 174.
Paralysis, 174.
Paralysize, 174.
Paralyze, 175.
Parapet, 120, 121.
Parasite, 366.
Parchment, 161.
Parenthese, sb., 174.
Parenthese, v. a., 174.
Parenthesize, 20, 174.
Parlour, 247.
Partially, for not totally, 191, 192, 276.
Particular, old use of, 247.
Parts, for talents, 292.
Party, for person, 81, 345.
Pasche, 112.
Pass, well to, 247.
Passage, v. n., 292.
Passager, 161.
Passing, for more than, 248.
Past, for after, 124.
Patrial, 133.
Patriarchess, 187.
Patriot, adj., 256, 317, f.
Patriotic, 117, 286, 317, f.
Paupérisme, 316.
Peach, v. a., 248.
Peachify, v. a., 26.
Peasant, 161.
Peculiar from, 82.
Pedagogue, 366.
Pedant, der. of, 175.
Pence, der. of, 163.
Pend, for pen, v. a., 361.
Penetrabilis, 168.
Penetrable, 109.
Penetrate, 109.
Pennant, 161.
Perfectionator, 173.
Perfectionment, 22, 103.
Perflation, 205.
Perk, for perch, 238, 248.
Perspective, 157.
Pert, der. of, 162.
Pervert, sb., 130, 308.
Pessimist, 311.
Pessimize, 194.
Petrific, 158.
Petted, for piqued, 248.
Phantasie, 356.
Phantasmalian, 100.
Pheasant, 161.
Philander, 275, 299.
Philosophaster, 179.
Philosophastry, 179.
Philosophate, v. n., 186.
Philosopher, v. n., 179.
Philosophiser, v. n., 179.
Philosophism, &c., 178, 179.
Philosophisme, 179.
Philosophist, &c., 178, 179.
Philosophistical, 178.
Philosophobist, 176.
Philosophy, v. n., 186.
Phrase, for single word, 306.
Physical, a use of, 309.
Physicist, 308.
Physiocrat, 152, 289.
Piccadilly, 107.
Picnician, sb., 26.
Pictorial, 286, f.
Pictural, sb., 287.
Picturesqueness, 126.
Pin, for mood, 248.
Pistate, v. a., 138.
Pize, 248.
Placation, 109.
Plagiary, 271.
Plainlier, &c., 347.
Plain-sailing, 176.
Plasticity, 308.
Platitude, &c., 309, f.
Pleasure, v. a., 248, 292.
Plebiscite, 310.
Plenipo, 187.
Plenty, adj., 248.
Plunder, 113.
Plurality, old use of, 248.
Pocket-handkerchief 157.
Poetess, 123.
Police, 124.
Politien, 110.
Polysemant, 170.
Ponderous, 108.
Pontificalibus, in, 254.
Pontoon, 120.
Poor's box, 218.
Popeling, der. of, 247.
Port, der. of, 187.
Portentous, 108.
Pos, 187.
Possibilitate, v. a., 22, 184.
Posthumous, 158.
Posthumous compositions, 202.
Power, for great deal, 104, 249.
Prayerful, 130, f.
Preferable, old use of, 249.
Preheminence, 159.
Preliminary, sb., 120.
Premit, for premise, 133.

Prepuce, 112.
Prejudice, misuse of, 198, 201.
Presbyter, eccentric etymologies of, 50.
President, for precedent, 159.
Prétentieux, 318.
Pretentious, 173, 318.
Prevent, for forestall, 166, 249.
Priest, der. of, 163.
Priest, false der. of, 50.
Primeval, 117.
Primosity, 176.
Privado, 249.
Problematical, 122.
Proceeds, sb., 122.
Process, old use of, 205.
Proclivity, 307.
Proctor, 175.
Prodigious, 108.
Productibility, 181.
Profaness, 189.
Professional, sb., 305.
Professoress, 187.
Profile, 182.
Progress, v. n., 72, 285, f.
Progresser, v. n., 314, f.
Progressif, 314, f.
Proheme, 159.
Prolix, 109.
Promettre, slang use of, 259.
Promiscuous, 111.
Promiscuously, 111.
Promise, for assure, 249, f.
Proness, 189.
Propone, for propound, 110.
Propoune, for propound, 361.
Prorogation, 366.
Prosaist, 308.
Prothonotary, 158.
Pseudomantist, 26.
Publicist, 288.
Pudgy, 273, 319.
Pudsey, 273.
Puff, for praise, 130.
Pulse, sb. plu., 250.
Punne, for pound, v. a., 361.
Pure, for very, 250.
Purely, for notably, 250.
Puritant, 162.
Push an investigation, to, 283.
Put, sb., 250.
Put up, v. a., 250, 281.
Put up with, to, 279, f.
Put upon, to, 203, 250.
Putid, 117, 180.
Quaft, for quaff, 361.
Qualitative, 133.
Quat, for squat, 250.
Quisby, 273.
Quite, 51, f.
Quite a child, &c., 276.
Raid, 307.
Raillery, 127.
Rampart, 120.
Ransom, der. of, 163.
Ratio, 95.
Rational, 112.
Raught, for reached, 139, 206.
Realize, senses of, 292, 296, f.
Reap-hook, 119.
Reason, to have, 250.
Receptivity, 126, 308.
Reciprocal, 106.
Reckon, old use of, 251.
Recognize, 118.
Rocognosce, 118.
Recompense, for compensate, 251.
Reconnoitre, 120, 121, 122.
Reconvert, sb., 308.
Rectoress, 187.
Recuperate, 367.
Redaction, 310.
Reedify, 192.
Reenverse, v. a., 181.
Reestablish, 192.
Reestate, 299.
Reference of, in, 85, 87.
Refining, 109.
Regard, for relation, &c., 90, f.
Regard of, in, 84, f.
Regard of, with, 87.
Regard, in, for comparatively, 93.
Regimental, sb., 251.
Rehabilitate, 299.
Rehabilitation, 299.
Réhabiliter, 299.
Rehedification, 159.
Relation of, in, 94.
Relatively of, 85, 94.
Relativibility, 368.
Reliable, 320, 348.
Relief, 119.
Religion, 172.
Religionist, 166.
Relumine, v. a., 251.
Remain, sb., 119.
Remarker, 35.
Remnant, 163.
Remotion, 180.
Remuneration, 105, 106.
Rended, 57.
Rent, for rend, 57, 361.
Renverse, v. a., 180, 181.
Replete, 124.
Reposit, 251.
Repudiate, 117.
Requirement, 286.
Requisition, 283.
Respect, for relation, &c., 86, 88, f., 366.
Respect, in, for relatively, &c., 85, 91, f.
Respect of, in, 84, f.
Respect of, with, 87.
Respect, with, for relatively, &c., 85, 91, f.
Respectable, 288.

Respective, for relative, 93.
Respective, for due, respectful, &c., 93, 167.
Respectively, for relatively, 93.
Respectively to, 85, 93.
Resurrect, 194.
Resurrectionize, 194.
Retainal, 173.
Retrograde, 106.
Retrovert, sb., 308.
Revolt, v. a., 299.
Rewrite, &c., 60.
Rhinocerical, 174.
Rhinocerot, &c., 174.
Rhinocerotic, 174.
Rhodomontade, 158.
Rhyme, 158.
Rid, for rode, 207, 208.
Ridicule, 120, 127.
Ridicule, for ridiculousness, 255.
Rife, 125.
Righteous, 155.
Rightwise, 155.
Rigsby, 272.
Rimose, 251.
Rimpled, 251.
Ringle, der. of, 272.
Risible, misuse of, 198, 201.
Rivaless, 187.
Rive, 280.
Road, for inroad, 307.
Rode, for ridden, 207, 208.
Roll, for enroll, 251.
Rotund, sb., 266.
Round, for whisper, 361.
Roundabout, a dance, 251.
Round-house, for lock-up, 251.
Route, 127.
Row, for disturbance, 133.
Rudesbey, 273.
Rudesby, 272.
Run, for ran, 104, 207, 208.
Run down, to, 279, 280.
Rural, 111.
Rust, to take, 251.
Sacerdocracy, 176.
Sacrilegiously, 110.
Saloon, old use of, 251, f.
Same with, 303.
Sameness with, 303.
S'anastomoser, 174.
Sanction, v. a., 300.
Sandapile, 138.
Saturation, 129.
Saturity, 129.
Sausenger, 161.
Savage, 109.
Scand, for scan, 361.
Scantle, der. of, 272.
Sciential, 157.
Scientifial, 157.
Scientific, 109, 157.
Scientist, 309.
Sconce, sb., 252.
Sconce, v. a., 133, 252.
Scoundrel, adj., 256.
Seek, v. n., for apply, 252.
Seen, for versed, 252.
Semeiology, 45.
Senectude, 26.
Seneschalship, 133.
Sennight, 261.
Sentimentalist, 311.
Sentimentalize, 298.
Septuagenarian, 304.
Septuagesimal, misuse of, 12.
Sepulture, for sepulchre, 45, f., 360.
Sepulture, v. a., 149.
Sere, 280.
Serial, sb., 305.
Set, for sit, 104.
Sexagenarian, 305.
Sexagenary, 144.
Sheen, 123.
Shined, 207.
Shook, for shaken, 208.
Shore, from shear, 139.
Shred, for scatter, 252.
Shriftfather, 165.
Shunt, v. a., 300.
Sick room, 127.
Significative, 109.
Significative, for expressive, 252.
Simplician, 111.
Sithence, 356.
Sitten, 139.
Sketchy, 319.
Slided, 207.
Slingsby, 273.
Smally, 188.
Smash, 128.
Smatch, sb., 253.
Smoke, v. a., old uses of, 253.
Smoky, old use of, 253.
Smoothen, 40.
Smoulder, 122, 123, 367.
Sneakbill, 272.
Sneaksbill, 272.
Sneaksby, 272.
Sniff, snift, 59.
Snore, snort, 59.
So . . . as, &c., old use of, 253.
Soberize, 298.
Sobriety, 108.
Soddened, 59.
Solicitate, 108.
Solidarity, 310.
Solidary, 310.
Solidity, technical sense of, 310.
Soly, for solely, 188.
Somehow or another, 26.
Sooth, in, 123.
Sound, for swoon, 253.
Soune, for sound, 361.
Souse, for sous, 266.
Sparagrass, 161.

Sparagus, 161.
Sparrowgrass, 161.
Special, sb., 305.
Specialist, 308.
Specie, old uses of, &c., 253, f., 310.
Species, old uses of, 254.
Speech-lore, 183.
Spoke, for spoken, 207, 208.
Sprang, for sprung, 208.
Sputatilic, 158.
Square, in comp., for cornered, 254.
Squirrelline, 176.
Stand with, old use of, 254.
Stand-point, 289.
Stare, 342, 343.
Start-up, adj., 254.
Starvation, 279, f., 287.
Starve, 280, 281, 368.
Starve, misuse of, 194.
Steel, for bastile, 162.
Steorfan, 281.
Sterling, der. of, 187.
Stive, v. a., 254.
Stole, for stolen, 208.
Storey, 166.
Story, for plot, 254.
Strange of, to make, 254, f.
Strappado, 255.
Stratagem, 366.
Stratagème, 4.
Streak, for rung, 255.
Strenuous, 105, 106.
Stupendious, 159, 160.
Stupenduous, 160.
Sub-clavian, 175.
Subjective, 126.
Subjectivity, 308.
Sublime, for sublimity, 255.
Substantival, 318.
Substraction, 119, 159.
Subtily, 188.
Suburbial, 173.
Suburbian, 173, 367.
Succedaneous, 43.
Succumb, 122.
Such . . who, 256.
Sufficiency, 119.
Suite, 122.
Summarist, 311.
Summarize, 194.
Summist, 144.
Superannuation, 124.
Supercherie, 4.
Superchery, 182.
Superfinesse, 189.
Superweening, 100.
Supplement, v. a., 300.
Supplementation, 300.
Surebie, 272.
Suresby, 272.
Surgeon, 163.
Surquedry, 182.
Suspect, sb., 167.
Suspectable, 167.
Suspectful, 167.
Suspense, v. a., 226.
Suspicable, &c., 167.
Sweeting, sb., 256.
Sycophant, adj., 256.
Swoon, 59.
Swound, 59.
Syllable, &c., 161.
Syllogize, 43.
Symbolatrous, 367.
Symbolatry, 367.
Symbology, 180, 367.
Symbolology, 180.
Synonym, 172.
Syntaxical, 176.
Synteresis, 367.
Systemize, 175.
Tabby, sb., 237.
Tables, old use of, 256.
Tact, 286.
Take in, for dupe, 125.
Take place, old use of, 256.
Take notice, old use of, 256.
Take shame to one's self, to, 283.
Talent, talents, 61, f., 361.
Talent, for talon, 161.
Talented, 70, f.
Talentif, 65.
Talentum and its derivatives, 64, f.
Tally, adv., 188.
Tansy, der. of, 162.
Taplash, sb., 256.
Tardity, 61.
Tarring, for tarrying, 189.
Tartar, 158.
Teached, 139, 206, 207.
Technology, misuse of, 175.
Teens, 162.
Telegram, 100, 158, 314.
Telegrapheme, 158.
Temperance, 108, 366.
Temperated, 256.
Tender, 161.
Tenent, 162.
Teresa, sb., 256.
Terrorist, 311.
Terrorize, 298.
Test, v. a., 300.
Testimonialist, 311.
Testimonialize, 194.
Tetrastich, 112.
That, old uses of, 257.
That, ellipsis of, 257.
That, misuse of, 202.
Theaterian, 112.
Their, for 's, 356, 359.
Theiris, theirs, 358.
Their self, 352.
Their selfs, 352.
Them that, &c., 205.
Them self, 352.
Them selfs, 352.
Think, for expect, 271.
Thrall, thraldom, 108.
Threeness, 165.
Throwed, 104, 139, 207.

Ticket, for visiting-card, 125, 126.
Tiff of punch, 257.
Till, ellipsis of, 271, f.
Timid, 117.
Tim-whiskey, 257.
Tipple, der. of, 272.
Tipsy, der. of, 272.
To, old uses of, 258.
To, for compared with 363.
To, for on, 205.
To, for with, 271.
To, ellipsis of, 271.
To, misuses of, 85, 200.
Tobesick, v. a., 110.
Tolibant, &c., 111.
Tom-axe, 201.
Too, misuse of, 54.
Tootsy, sb., 273.
Totality, 286.
Tour, v. n., 301.
Tourist, 311.
Tout, v. n., 134, 287.
Touter, 134.
Toward, old use of, 259.
Toxophilite, 175.
Toxophilus, 175.
Tractarian, &c., 320.
Trait, 127.
Tramontane, 259.
Transatlantic, 275.
Transverse, v. a., 259.
Treacle, 128, 161.
Tremenduous, 160.
Tribal, 134.
Tricksy, 272.
Trisyllable, adj., 227.
Tritical, 259.
Triumphant, for triumphal, 167, 168.
Truant, 161.
Truepenny, 156.
Trustworthless, 176.
Truthful, 287.
Tunic, 112.
Turbant, &c., 112, 161
Turned of, old use of, 259.
Twaddle, for twaddler, 292.
Tyran, &c., 161.
Tyranness, 161, 259.
Tyrant, 161.
Ugglesome, 173.
Ugsome, &c., 173.
Ultra, sb., 163.
Ultraism, 311.
Unalienable, 259.
Unconversable, 110.
Uncreditable, 260.
Undeadly, 166.
Under, old use of, 260.
Under way, 176.
Underganging, 166.
Underwent, have, 58.
Undiscovered, for unexplored, 268.
Undisprivacied, 193, 195.
Uneath, 190.
Unexceptionable, &c. misuse of, 201, 316.
Unexpressive, 173.
Unfillinglike, 166.
Unfullmaking, 166.
Ungain, adj., 203, 260.
Ungueal, 175.
Unideal, misuse of, 198, 201.
Unmind, v. a., 176.
Unnoticed, 285.
Unpicturesque, 126.
Unpleasantry, 275.
Unrespectable, 288.
Unroningness, 166.
Unshakened, 59, 361.
Unsuspectable, 167.
Untalented, 72.
Untholinglike, 166.
Untuneable, for inharmonious, 260.
Unwell, 124, 125, 287.
Unwisdom, 314.
Unwittingness, 165.
Upon, old use of, 273.
Upset, sb., 275.
Use, sb., for interest, 260.
Usuring, 189.
Usury, 166.
Utiliser, v. a., 129.
Utilitarian, 316, 320.
Utilize, 128, 129, 167, 297.
Vales, der. of, 162.
Valetudinary, adj., 260.
Valetudo, 186.
Valuator, 173.
Vapour, v. a., 260.
Vapours, old use of, 260.
Vapulate, 367.
Veheterinarius, 187.
Velveret, 260.
Vernacular, adj., 117.
Vernacular, sb., 305.
Very pleased, &c., 54, f.
Very shining, &c., 55.
Vet, 187.
Veto, sb., 310.
Vetoist, 311.
Viable, 181.
Viandry, for viands, 312.
Vicissitous, 315.
Vicissitudinary, &c., 315.
Vindictive, 163.
Viparious, 101.
Visitant, 273.
Visto, 266.
Vitable, 181.
Vivable, 181.
Vociferate, 283.
Voice, for word, 367.
Volcano, nobiliary pronunciation of, 319.
Vote one a bore, to, 283.
Vulgar, for vulgar tongue, 305.
Vulgar, sb., misuse of, 201.
Vulgarian, 312.
Vulnerate, 367.
Waff, 59.
Wafry, for wafers, 312.
Waft, 59.
Wafting, 119.

Walking-stick, 348.
Wanehope, 165.
Warm, for affluent, 260, f.
Wart, for wast, 79.
Was, you, 208, 209.
Was a month, that day, 203, 261.
Wash-woman, 261.
Weary, v. n., 275, 301, f.
Weather-beatenest, 189.
Wedbreak, 166.
Wend, 56, f.
Wended, 56, f.
Went, has, &c., 58, 360.
Wentedst, 361.
Were, for wast, 79, 362.
Werest, for wert, 361.
Werst, for wast, 79.
Wert, for wast, 77, f., 361.
Wet finger, with a, 261.
What, superfluous, 25, 261, f.
Whereabouts, sb., 307
Which, old use of, 262.
While, 62.
Whiles, 62.
Whimsey, 273.
Whisper a person, to, 262.
Whittle, sb., 292.
Who, for which, 353.
Whole, for all, 205.
Wholy, 188.
Whom, for which, 353.
Whose, for of which, 348.
Wight, 123.
Wise, to make, 255.
Wiseliest, 188.
Wish, v. n., old use of, 262.
Wit-craft, 183.
With, old uses of, 263, f.
With the widest, &c., 264, f., 368.
With the worse, 265.
With, acquiescence, 258.
Withal, for with, 265.
Witherwin, 166.
Withinside, 265.
Without, for unless, 167.
Witword, 165.
Woe, adj., 265.
Woful-wan, 176.
Womanhood, 122.
Womanize, 40.
Wondered, it cannot be, &c., 201, 265.
Wording, 123.
Worsen, v. a. and n., 300, f.
Wristlet, 157.
Writ, for wrote, 139, 208.
Writ, for written, 139, 208.
Wrongous, 155.
Wrote, for written, 104, 208.
Yearninglike, 166.
Young person, for young woman, 276.
Youris, for yours, 358.
Zealotism, 104.
Zed, 140.
Zedity, 140.
Zee for zed, 140.
Zenith, 120.
Zero, 311.

THE END.

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, PRINTERS.

WORKS BY MR. HALL.

SANSKRIT.

The Âtmabodha, with its Commentary, and the Tattvabodha. Pp. 29 and 9. Mirzapore: 1852.

The Sânkhyapravachana, with its Commentary. Pp. 66, 233, and 44. Calcutta: 1856.

The Sûryasiddhânta, with its Commentary. Pp. 4, 388, and 13. Calcutta: 1859.

The Vâsavadattâ, with its Commentary. Pp. 56, 300, and 6. Calcutta: 1859.

The Sânkhyasâra. Pp. 51 and 48. Calcutta: 1862.

The Daṣarûpa, with its Commentary, and four chapters of the Nâṭyaṣâstra. Pp. 39 and 241. Calcutta: 1865.

HINDÎ.

The Tarkasangraha, translated into Hindî from the Sanskrit and English. Pp. 24 and 48. Allahabad: 1850.

The Siddhântasangraha, translated into Hindî from the Sanskrit and English. Pp. 7, 72, and 96. Agra: 1855.

Elements of Hindî and Braj Bhâkhâ Grammar, by Dr. J. R. Ballantyne. New edition, with alterations and additions. Pp. 38. London: 1868.

Hindî Reader. Pp. 19 and 184, quarto. Hertford: 1870.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Lectures on the Nyâya Philosophy, Sanskrit and English. Revised edition. Pp. 14 and 80. Benares: 1852.

The Râjanîti, in the Braj Bhâshâ Language. Pp. 7, 167, 10, and 14. Allahabad: 1854.

Classical Selections. Pp. 2 and 256. Agra: 1855.

A Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems. Pp. 2 and 236. Calcutta: 1859.

A Rational Refutation of the Hindu Philosophical Systems, translated from the Hindî and Sanskrit. Pp. 10 and 284. Calcutta: 1862.

Ane Compendious and Breve Tractate, &c. By William Lauder (1556). Pp. 11 and 39. London: 1864. Second edition, revised, pp. 11 and 43. London: 1869.

The Ṛigvedasaṁhitâ, Professor H. H. Wilson's Translation, Vol. 1; Second Edition, with a new Index and a Postscript. Pp. 51 and 348. London: 1866.

Sir David Lyndesay's Works. Four Parts. Pp. 548. London: 1866—1869.

Benares, Ancient and Medieval: A Monograph. Pp. 23. Hertford: 1868.

The Vishṇupurâṇa, Annotated Edition of Professor H. H. Wilson's Translation. Five Volumes. Pp. 140 and 200; 343; 343; 347; 392. London: 1864—1870.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON MR. HALL'S 'RECENT EXEMPLIFICATIONS OF FALSE PHILOLOGY'.

From 'The New-York Daily Tribune.'

"If such a work as 'Recent Exemplifications of False Philology' were sold for a sixpence, or even circulated gratuitously, it would, probably, discredit its writer quite as much as it would discredit Mr. White. Being 'held' or sold at a prohibitory price, it will, probably,

'Die among its worshippers',

supposing that that word can truly be put in the plural."

From 'The Independent.'

"If a book deserves to be widely read, because it is almost the worst that can be written on a special subject,—on the principle which induced the Spartans to make Helots drunk before the children, as a frightful example, we ought cordially to recommend Mr. Fitzedward Hall's *Recent Exemplifications of Fals Philology*. [This highly religious paper, as if the author's alleged sins were not grievous enough, here forges a little bad spelling for him.] The pamphlet is altogether a remarkable example of literary ferocity; and its chief purpose is to fall foul on Mr. Grant White, in which it succeeds admirably. But, though Mr. White is the chief enemy, the writer attacks, with impartial virulence, pretty nearly everybody who has said a word about the English language for the last fifty years. Landor, De Quincey, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and men of less name are, all, assailed before us with handsful of indiscriminated mud. And, when we have finished reading the book, we have a general impression left on our mind, that Mr. Hall wishes it to be understood, that all philologists are mad, and that he is their keeper.

"There is quite enough slang and vilification to be found in newspapers at present; so we shall not cull any of Mr. Hall's hot-house flowers of rhetoric. But there is a useful word to be said about this gentleman's general drift. All the persons whom he assails have criticized current English speech, spoken and written, with a view to its purification by a standard of culture. That undertaking may be difficult; perhaps it is impossible; few would be found to say that it is not laudable or desirable. A man must be sunk very low, before he contentedly resigns the

prospect of improvement of his language, whether he be Frenchman, German, Englishman, or Cherokee, when the possibility of the improvement is pointed out. Mr. Hall *has* fallen quite below the point, and revels in his fall, and declaims against everybody who, on grounds of good taste or public necessity, desires to keep the English language within some limits of scholarship and artistic feeling. Of English books of all centuries he seems to have read a quantity incompatible with sanity; and it is quite sufficient, that a word is found in any of them, for him to attack anybody who objects to its use now in a new or an old sense. His notion of a language evidently is 'all the words used at all times in all printed books.' The office of literature in castigating language is quite unknown to him. His notion seems to be, that everybody should say what he likes, and write what he likes, and so language will grow healthily. Never mind what happens to words, in the process. Suppose people *do* say now, for example, in England, 'awfully jolly.' Why, all the harm that can come will be, that, in a century, 'awful' will mean 'jolly,' and 'jolly' will mean 'awful.' And how good it will be for trade; for, of course, all the Bibles and hymn-books will have to be re-edited! Such writers as Mr. Hall can do no good, and they may do harm, by preventing serious study of a most serious subject among the unreflecting. As may be expected, Mr. Hall gives ample evidence of his being no philologer himself. He seems to know little German, and makes a great fuss about quite commonplace Greek etymology. We observe, on the last page of the volume, a list of his printed works, and mention of one in preparation, with the title 'Modern English,' concerning which last we can only repeat, with much feeling, what Cowper says of the illustrious John Gilpin's performance on horseback:

'And when he next doth ride abroad,
May we be there to see.'

We should add, however, that this little book contains a good deal of information for the curious, and will often interest where it does not edify."

From 'The Golden Age.'

"There are some good books of a bad kind; and there are many bad books of a good kind; but this book is the worst that we have ever seen of a very bad kind. . . Dr. Hall is full of learned pretence, both as to matter and manner, and crowds his pages with quotations, the most of which are entirely without interest

and of no use whatever, except to bear witness to Dr. Hall's acquaintance with literature. Indeed, his quotations, and the notes that infest his pages, make his book one of the most forbidding we have ever taken in hand. . . . Mr. Hall—we beg pardon, Dr. Hall, (for, knowing something of the value and significance of an Honorary D.C.L. of Oxford, we are not so deeply impressed by it as this possessor of it evidently expected us to be) —well, then, Dr. Hall sets out, as he declares, to subject Mr. Grant White to a strict appreciation, 'that it may operate as a salutary warning.' The insolence of such a declaration is insuperable, and no less ridiculous; but, as to Hall's right to submit Mr. White, or any one else who has published a book, to a strict appreciation, there can be no doubt. By so doing he might have conferred a benefit upon the public, and upon Mr. White; and he might have done it in a scholarly spirit, and with the manner of a gentleman. On the contrary, he has done it like a braggart, a bully, and a blackguard. . . As to particular points, Dr. Hall may be sometimes right, and Mr. White wrong; but we see no reason to change our original opinion as to the value, the interest, and the needfulness of Mr. White's book. And as to Dr. Hall's we have been chiefly concerned with it as an exhibition of arrogance, of pompous pretence, and of literary brutality."

From 'The Boston Advertiser.'

"Mr. Richard Grant White's book on 'Words and Their Uses' bids fair to be preëminently useful in settling what is good usage of the English language, but not exactly in the way he intended. The attention he succeeded in arousing, coupled with his errors, not to say ignorance, has provoked to enter the field of debate many champions of the mother-tongue. Professor Lounsbury, of Yale College, in the columns of 'The College Courant,' made it evident that Mr. White's dicta were not infallible; but Fitzedward Hall, formerly Professor of the Sanskrit Language and Literature in King's College, London, has, even more completely than Professor Lounsbury, exposed his shortcomings. In a little work entitled 'Recent Exemplifications of False Philology,' Mr. White is handled in a way which it would be kindness to call merely severe. In many particulars, and these essentially exemplary ones, Mr. White, as an authority, is annihilated."

From 'The New-York Mail.'

"Scholars who know our language nearly and familiarly, who have traced it to its sources, who have followed it through its unfoldings, who have watched it varying with the varying seasons of thought and changing hue and texture, with the changing hopes and sensations of the centuries,—such only can understand and honour sufficiently its wealth and majesty, great and venerable. Fitzedward Hall, formerly Professor of Sanskrit in King's College, London, . . . a profound philologist, versed in many languages, knows the self-sustaining strength, and the enduring and fruitful riches of the English tongue, and bears for it a love alike patriotic and scholarlike. Therefore is his indignation hot against those whom he believes to be smatterers and triflers, much puffed-up, as word-censors, with the self-confidence which comes from half-knowledge. . . . . This little book deserves notice otherwise, as a veritable curiosity of literature. In its hundred and fourteen pages, are direct references to, or citations of, over three hundred authors,—an evidence of faithful work which deserves all praise."

From 'The New-York Times.'

"It is especially in regard to their knowledge of the actual history of English words, that Prof. Hall scourges the deficiencies of the men whom he reviews. And he does it, certainly, from a height to which hardly another English student of the present day has ascended. His reading has been immense, his observation keen, his annotation most industrious. . . . But we have too high an opinion of Mr. Hall, and have enjoyed his little book too much, to want to close our notice with an unfavourable judgment upon a point of minor consequence. We will add, rather, that, in his argument about *telegraph* and *telegram*, he shows himself able to argue questions of classical as well as of English propriety; we heartily concur, moreover, in his conclusion, that *telegram* has, in its general acceptance and use, the only support that it needs, in order to hold up its head in good English society. . . . . Mr. Hall has doubled the value of his book by providing it with ample indexes of authors quoted and of words treated. Its character justifies us in forming very high expectations of the work on 'Modern English,' by which he promises that it shall be followed."

From 'The Nation.'

"Mr. Hall passes unnoticed, or with only a word or two of condemnation, some of those who have most moved our ire, as Alford and his antagonist Moon, Blackley, and Gould. He expends a few trenchant introductory pages on Landor and Coleridge, De Quincey and the London *Athenæum*. But his chief exemplar of false philology is Mr. Richard Grant White, as exhibiting himself in the volume, more than once mentioned of late in these pages, entitled 'Words and Their Uses.' The second and revised edition of this work had not yet made its appearance, when Mr. Hall undertook to expose its weaknesses; but the exposure will apply very nearly or quite as well to the new as the old form of it; for we have not observed that the alterations recently made affect any of the points criticized. More than one additional revision may be made, we think, still leaving a plenty of matter for adverse criticism. Mr. White's dogmas and semblances of arguments have met with many severe answers, and from diverse points of view; his philological knowledge, as to the history of English words and forms, has been made the chief subject of one formidable attack; his ideas of general grammar, of another; his command of English authorities, and the soundness and good taste of his decisions on disputed points of usage, of yet others; and it is in this last direction that Dr. Hall's criticisms expend themselves. They are, throughout, pungent and able; and they are founded on a wide acquaintance with English literature, a philological cultivation, and an acuteness and penetration, to which his antagonist can make no pretence. . . . Without claiming the title, or putting forward any pretensions, either to 'scholarship' or to absolute 'reason' and infallible 'taste,' Dr. Hall is really a scholar, and a profound one, known, as such, in three continents; for his contributions to Sanskrit and other Oriental learning have been a credit both to America, the land of his birth, and England, the country of his adoption, in India, the scene of the larger share of his life's labour. Not deeming Mr. White a foeman altogether worthy of his steel, we welcome his present production especially as an earnest of the greater work on 'Modern English,' which he announces as in preparation, and which we hope to receive from him within no long time, sure that it will be a valuable contribution to the knowledge of our native tongue."